

## Eastern Illinois University The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

3-22-2011

# March 22, 2011

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 22, 2011" (2011). *Minutes*. 13.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/13](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/13)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 22 March (Vol. XXXIV, No. 13)

The 2010 – 2011 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at: <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>

Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

### **I. Call to order by Chair John Pommier at 2:00pm.** (Booth Library Conference Room)

Present: A. Adom, J. Best, J. Coit, M. Fero, T. Leonce, A. Methven, F. Mullins, M. Mulvaney, K. Padmaraju, J. Pommier, J. Stowell, D. Viertel, A. White, M. Worthington, J. Prillaman. Excused: M. Fero, L. Taylor, A. White

Guests: Blair Lord (Provost); William Weber (VPBA) Adam Due, UPD; Eric Davidson, Health Service/Health Education Resource Center; Gary Hanebrink, Safety Officer; Katie McCarthy, Counseling Center; Rob Miller, General Counsel; Heather Webb, Student Standards.

### **II. Approval of the Minutes of 8 March**

### **III. Announcements**

### **IV. Communications**

- a. Email of 10 March, from Gail Richard, re: IAB Minutes
- b. Memo of 14 March, from Blair Lord, re: ACA Appointment

### **V. Old Business**

#### **A. Committee Reports**

1. Executive Committee: no report

2. Nominations Committee: Provost Lord asked Senate to appoint two representatives to the Achievement and Contribution Award committee. Pommier (Mulvaney) moved to nominate Marjorie Worthington and David Viertel. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Elections Committee: Vice-Chair Mulvaney stated that the list of candidates for Spring 2011 Faculty Elections has been submitted to ITS. Several positions still lack candidates. Mulvaney stated that extending the deadline resulted in more interest. Mulvaney stated that he is open to considering investigating the apparent lack of interest in faculty serving in elected positions. Senator Padmaraju stated she would be in favor of holding a Faculty Forum on the issue. Senator Viertel stated the forum should put us on the hot seat, so Senators could take questions and listen to concerns. Worthington stated the issue might have something to do with each department's DAC, because some departments put service higher on list of priorities. Mulvaney stated that he agreed, but hoped faculty would want to serve because they want to help, not because it's on the DAC. Mulvaney also stated that faculty might prefer nominated positions because the process is easier.

Chair Pommier asked Mulvaney to recommend a course of action. Mulvaney stated the unfilled positions could be filled by a special election in fall 2011. Stowell suggested that the end of Spring Semester might not be the right time to ask faculty to consider increasing their service load. Pommier stated that the elections have always been in the spring. Mulvaney stated that perhaps elections could be earlier in spring semester. Mulvaney (Padmaraju) moved to accept the list of candidates, and hold a special election in fall semester to fill any remaining vacancies. Padmaraju asked if write-in candidates might win election. Pommier stated they are required to get ten votes. Best stated he ran as a write-in candidate. Pommier stated that an email should be sent to Deans to inform them of the requirements for write-in candidates. Prillaman stated that Student Senate has appointed positions selected by the Chair, which allows Senate to recruit candidates in the fall. Pommier stated he believes elections are more transparent. Mulvaney stated he would email Deans and Committee Chairs regarding write-in candidacies.

Mulvaney noted that two candidates had filed for the College of Sciences position on the University Personnel Committee, but that there was an open position for an at-large candidate. Mulvaney suggested that he contact both candidates and see if one was willing to move to the at-large position.

Senator Adom asked if Senate bylaws allowed a write-in candidates. Mulvaney stated that write-in candidates must receive at least 10 votes to qualify for election. Adom asked if the system created disincentives to collect the 10 signatures required to be on the ballot. Stowell stated that he believed candidates would be risking failing to find an open seat. Adom stated that write-in candidates could be

elected without having had to answer the questions required of other candidates. Best stated that if that person could get enough people to write them in, they might be elected over people that did get on the ballot. Best noted that answering the questions from the different committees is optional. Mulvaney stated that there are some committees which do not require candidates to answer a question. Best stated that these concerns only come about because there are not enough candidates running for office. Mulvaney stated that it might be seen as part of a democratic process. Senator Viertel stated that it is a “none of the above” option, allowing faculty who don’t like any of the candidates to vote for somebody else. He asked if the write-in must run against one of the four existing candidates. Mulvaney stated that the write in would be a text box at the bottom of a list of candidates, and the voter can choose up to five, including the write-in. Senator Padmaraju stated that some councils meet at the same time, so if the meeting times were changed more faculty might run. Viertel wondered if being on Senate might preclude other service possibilities. Pommier stated that although the bylaws prohibit simultaneous service on Senate, CAA, CGS, or COTE, there are several other elected position. Viertel noted that CAA has plenty of candidates, compared to Senate. Motion to accept the list of candidates passed unanimously.

4. Faculty—Student Relations Committee: no report
5. Faculty—Staff Relations Committee: no report
6. Awards Committee: Stowell stated that the DFA committee would meet next Tuesday morning.
7. Faculty Forum Committee: no report
8. Other Reports

a. Provost’s Report

Lord stated an announcement would be made soon about the Dean of LCBAS search. VPBA Weber has received all the information and feedback from faculty regarding the Director of ITS search. The search for a new Director of CATS (Assistant VPAA) will bring candidates to campus at the end of Spring semester. Lord stated that the due date for Integrative Learning Award applications is tomorrow. He stated that a subcommittee of CAA will evaluate the submissions.

Lord stated that he has been collecting information on questions regarding distance learning. He stated that the Deans asked their Chairs about their use of distance learning, and that he and Mary Herrington-Perry were preparing a draft report that will categorize our distance learning efforts by the audience they reach. Lord stated that it thinks it shows that those efforts are well targeted, and the report will be submitted to the Senate. He stated that it will also be used by a committee on distance learning which he is still considering how to structure, and noted that such a committee should include representatives from SCE and CATS. Best asked Lord to clarify his comments about the committee. Lord stated that NCA wanted to see a structure on campus devoted to distance learning, so I created a structure for accreditation, but there will need to be a permanent structure. But as we started talking about distance education, there’s also been a desire for some policy or strategy thinking about that, which isn’t going to be just the administrative committee. I don’t have a permanent administrative committee, I’ve got an ad hoc one. Lord stated he hasn’t quite figured out how to put that together.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: Senator Methven stated that the committee had looked at the Ledger 1 accounts, these are the appropriated budgets for the last four fiscal years, so see if any of the numbers had changed. A list of those questions and concerns was forwarded to William Weber and Mike Maurer. They sent responses to the questions, and we discussed the responses, and a summary was sent to the Senate and to Weber and Maurer. The Committee appreciated Weber and Maurer’s willingness to answer questions and desire for transparency. Methven stated that the effort has illustrated how difficult it is to manage all the elements of the University budget, and that he believes the budget is in good hands. Best stated that it is important for the Senate to ask questions about the budget, and that the committee received a great deal of cooperation. He stated that this report looks at a high level of money management, how does that money moving around down to those Deans and Directors affect the overall budget. Pommier thanked the committee for its work.

c. Other

**B. Other Old Business**

Best () moved to remove from the table the motion of February 22 for Senate to accept without endorsement, the report of Senator Best regarding the timeline for changes regarding Nursing in the EIU Master Plan. Motion passed unanimously. Abstain: Adom.

Viertel asked whether the report would go in the minutes. Best stated he would like to include the report in the minutes. Mulvaney asked if Best would like it to be a communication to the Senate, to make it

part of the public record. Stowell noted that the motion doesn't include the method of dissemination, and that could be determined later. Viertel asked if Senate could vote to include the report in the minutes of the meeting. Best stated he believed there was no impediment to doing that from the bylaws. Methven (Stowell) agreed to modify the motion, so that it would require the report to be included in the minutes. Motion passed unanimously. Abstain (Adom, Leonce).

## **VI. New Business**

A. Campus Security/Safety: Dan Nadler, VPSA; William Weber, VPBA; Adam Due, UPD; Eric Davidson, Health Service/Health Education Resource Center; Gary Hanebrink, Safety Officer; Katie McCarthy, Counseling Center; Rob Miller, General Counsel; Heather Webb, Student Standards;

Nadler stated that Bill Weber and I share responsibility for security, for helping to prepare for emergencies, and helping manage, and recover from them. He stated that the campus has made great strides in this area over the last three years. We actively participate in at least one emergency drill per year, which typically includes University and Charleston Police, the Fire Department, The Coles County Emergency Management Agency, the Red Cross, and Sara Bush Lincoln health system. We also participate in tabletop exercises dealing with emergencies like a weather emergency, or an active shooter.

Due stated the campus Police's role involves education, but is mostly prevention and response.

Davidson stated the Health Service conducts health education and promotion, and wellness activities, and is also involved with decision involving the medical clinic.

McCarthy stated that the Counseling Center's role involved identification of student issues, and some intervention.

Webb stated that Student Standards deals with student behaviors both on and off campus, identifies students and behaviors that could be a threat, and intervenes when necessary. They also participate in the Student Support committee, which meets to share information.

Miller stated that he participates on EIU's threat response team, serves as a resource to other groups on campus, and works with the Counseling Center on students in distress. His role is to help identify and prevent crises, and to balance rights of students and staff.

Nickels stated that she is Director of the Office of Civil Rights, and serves as chair of the campus threat assessment team. The team was formed in response to a state statute. The team are not first responders, more a group charged with reviewing information after threats and making assessments and recommendations to bodies on campus.

Nadler stated that generally speaking Weber primarily deals with facility issues (fire, flood, pipes breaking, freezes, earthquake), while he deal with issues involving students, faculty, and staff, and that because many issues intersect we work together very closely.

Hanebrink stated his position is basically a liaison between the campus and outside governments and emergency management agencies. In the past three years the outdoor speaker system has been improved and can be activated by patrolman on the beat. They can also make direct announcements to the community. Many buildings have new fire alarm system with a speaker system, and we are working on a fiber optics package that will bring live voice into buildings, that will be installed in 16 new buildings. The same message can be sent out from the annunciator box in office suites, and we are programming around 170 classrooms with popup computerized message. When activated a message will popup in computer, which will eliminate some of the issues around text messaging.

We also ask the various departments to approve an emergency plan, and to cover that at least once a year. For training, we have a drill or exercise every year. In 2012 there will be a statewide exercise on campus.

Nadler stated that 3 years ago the University subscribed to a vendor who set up Alert EIU, if you have a cellphone with text messaging you can subscribe for that service. If your carrier charges for texts, you will get charged. The service we would use in case of immanent danger, the highest alert. If we had a subject armed, an immediate danger to campus, we would send a text message, this is in addition to email and campus alarms. We test the message system every semester. A couple of years ago we experimented with email. We found away through ITS to shut down all other traffic on the system. If we have something to send out, it's sent out in two seconds rather than having to go through the other traffic. As a result of drills identified RF frequencies that are better to use, so we don't have to switch to new frequencies in an emergency. Each time we've done a test we've found new things to do to make the campus safer.

Senator Best stated that with regard to the shooting of Gabrielle Giffords, the accused student was identified at the community college. Ultimately I think he was enjoined from the buildings and campus. Do we have any means of identifying potentially very dangerous individuals? And what kind of responsibilities do we have in sharing information with other constituencies? Nadler stated that it is important to be proactive on these matters. Twice or three times a year the Provost and I send out emails about behavioral warning signs. As a result of that more and more information is coming forward from staff and faculty about what's happening in the classroom. Faculty are encouraged to always report if they feel something is wrong. We find a lot of crossover. If a student is behaving in a certain way in the classroom, it is likely they are behaving in similar ways in student housing, or their employment. Webb stated that faculty should make sure they report things, not just things they observe, but also that they see in emails or papers, something that is off. The Student Support team has representatives from Student Standards, Counseling, Police, Housing, and Minority Affairs, and discusses about calls from faculty, opportunity for the different campus agencies to see if students on their radar. The other function is as a group have consultations about existing cases. It is so very important for faculty to call someone when they know things. When a number of faculty have called about the same students, we were glad they called so we could put the pieces together. McCarthy stated that often the Counseling Center can't give out information, but we can collect it, and it provides a chance for gathering other information. If you are scared about a student you have reason to be.

Webb stated that when a student is no longer welcome, we have a lot of measures are in place. Students that are suspended and expelled go on a list, and we do put a notation on the transcript. The student may choose to go somewhere else, and it is appropriate to know for other institution to know why they left Eastern. McCarthy on the front page of the counseling website is a link to the Identifying Student Distress Handbook.

Worthington asked, if a faculty member identifies a student, what should be our response to our student, should we tell student we are informing the Counseling Center, should we tell student to get help.

McCarthy stated that depends on the student, but generally students more likely to come to Counseling if faculty recommend them. Worth asked if faculty should advise students with problems. McCarthy said yes, unless there are safety concerns. She also stated that info from faculty isn't considered confidential, which faculty should take into account if there are safety concerns.

Senator Padmaraju stated that sometimes when students have absence issues and we call them in to talk, they talk about other issues, and asked how faculty should counsel them. McCarthy stated that Counseling has faculty walk students over, and had them call Counseling from the faculty member's office. Nadler stated that if Student Affairs gets a call from faculty, we'll do a wellness check, check the dorm, or their house or apartment if they live off campus. Sometimes the student just needed to go out of town, but means a lot to let them know someone is interested in their welfare. If a student is not showing up for your class, it is highly likely they are not showing up for other classes. McCarthy stated that the faculty member's approach should depend on their relationship with the students. Nadler stated that the more people we have on the same page, the better off the student is going to be in the long run.

Senator Leonce asked if statistics were available on campus safety issues, which would allow comparisons of different matters of concern, or between different years, or with other institutions? Nadler stated EIU is required by law to collect and publish crime statistics. By and large we have a very safe community, off campus and on campus. Police officers, on a good day when weather is good, they patrol simultaneously by vehicle, bicycle, and on foot, and are an active part of the community. The campus has 19 blue emergency phones, a host of security cameras. The cameras are not actively monitored, but we can go back and look. If you want to see those statistics go to the Police website. Due stated that the Department of Education has statistics from all institutions, but I don't know if their website has a screen where you compare them all at once. Leonce asked if there were any trends in recent years. Due stated that EIU is in the middle of a cornfield, and has very little crime. The things that do change are alcohol arrests, if here are additional officers hired, there are more DUIs.

Padmaraju asked if the University keeps any stats on psychological issues. Nadler stated that Counseling Center records are a highly protected area with regard to confidentiality. If it results in some kind of crime, we report the crime. We keep data on that internally, and that is an area with increasing numbers of concern nationally. Students are indicating they have higher stress levels, and increasingly feel they need to see counselors. Since I've been here we've added two counselors. The social stigma against seeking

counseling is not gone, but is beginning to fade away. The Center is proactive, and gets out into the student community, even does silly things so students aren't frightened. McCarthy referenced the "No more secrets" posters. She also stated that the Center website provides basic screenings via questionnaires, or also when students call, and we make sure to get dangerous cases in quickly. We are booked, but not more busy than counseling centers.

Stowell asked if during natural disaster, there would be a structure in place to help utilize volunteers?

Hanebrink stated that volunteers must be trained through a university program, but would be protected for the time you're on task.

Coit asked if local police or other agencies were noted when the University sends a student home. Webb stated that it is a tough situation, we need to respect students' privacy, but we do what we can in our campus community. The law does permit other institutions where students seeking admission, to contact my office, and ask would they be a danger, and I can have an open conversation. Due stated that it would also depend on the type of incident. If there's a crime involved we may be reporting it to other agencies. Most student conduct violations won't get reported, only major incidents. Best asked if a firearms violation would be reported. Due stated that it depends. Firearms violations are reported to state police, other weapons to STIC, if it's someone that's experimenting with making explosives, you want to get this out to as many as you can. Best stated this would be especially necessary when there's a mix of behaviors, including firearms, a propensity for violence, and psychopathology. Due stated that people age 18 or 19 are going to make some mistakes, and whether or not they are reported depends on what they've done. The shootings at Virginia Tech or in Arizona offer 20-20 hindsight. Best stated he agreed with that, and in Arizona Pima Community College had done its job with protecting students' safety, the question is what did we learn. Best stated that the country is behind in understanding the effects of psychopathology. Due stated faculty who are concerned should always report, and usually more than one person picks this up. Nadler stated that some of us have a little more flexibility than others. We err on the side of caution to protect safety, but we also have mounting numbers of state and federal regulations and licensing issues. McCarthy stated Counseling consults with Rob Miller more frequently.

Methven asked what faculty should do if they have a concern after hours or in off hours. Nadler stated that faculty should call the Counseling Center, there is a pager number that staffed 24 hours, or call police, and added that many of us are on email late or early. We would rather get a late night phone call, than have faculty not report something.

Pommier asked if faculty can undergo training to help them notice students who have issues. Nadler stated Student Affairs is included in new faculty orientation. McCarthy stated that Sandy Cox has gone to several different departments, at their request, to discuss these issues.

Mulvaney asked if Faculty Development could help publicize these issues. Nadler stated that he did a presentation for Faculty Development, as well as at the department level, and university level. Only a small number of our students are challenged beyond what they can handle at any given time. It is a big issue when it happens, but it's a small number of our students, and it's usually a short period of time before good information comes forward, and we're able to intervene, get them some information and get them on the right path.

Pommier asked if the Committee had gained in any insight from January exercise on campus? Nadler stated that anytime you go through an exercise there's something new that you learn, those are always at the core of anything you learn. One thing was that as the emergency is unfolding, you've got to deal with the whole perimeter, and for bystanders there's a curiosity that takes over, and people can end up inadvertently placing themselves in dangerous situations. That was a bit of a challenge last time when something like that happens so quickly.

Best stated that what the Threat Assessment team's work shows to external constituents, both people of state, and other institutions in Illinois, what we do at this state-assisted institution, and a pretty good series of questions have revealed that this is a thoughtful and comprehensive process, that these different departments seem to be meshing well together to help and protect students and keep our campus safe.

## **VII. Adjournment at 4pm.**

### **Future Agenda items:**

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit  
April 3, 2011

Report on the Planning Process Resulting in the Migration of the Nursing Program to the Physical Sciences Building.

John Best, Faculty Senator

**The Departments in the Physical Sciences Building (A Brief History):** The core structure of the Physical Sciences Building (PSB) on the campus of Eastern Illinois State Teachers College opened in 1937. Basically, there were three sciences taught in PSB from 1937 to 1970: Chemistry, Physics, and Geology. In the late 1960s a substantial addition to PSB was planned and built, to accommodate the growth of the programs in the physical sciences, congruent with the institution's newer role as a university. This addition, which opened in 1970, brought the total square footage in PSB up to its current nominal dimensions: 78,000 ft<sup>2</sup>. As is evident from elements of the design and layout of the rooms in the addition, this additional square footage was clearly intended for instruction in the physical sciences. However, in a decision that was made "over the weekend" by now-unknown persons, Psychology was instructed to pack up from its then-location (Old Main) and move into PSB (this part of the account has been attested to by many emeriti who have since retired, notably Sue Stoner (now deceased), Herbert Morice, and many others). When the addition opened in 1970, Psychology faculty offices, classrooms, and lab spaces were strewn throughout the building's four floors, and they remain that way to this day, to the lasting chagrin of the building's intended and "rightful" inhabitants.

#### **Timeline and Comments on the Updated Campus Master Plan with Regard to Migrating and Nonmigrating Departments:**

Tuesday, March 9, 2010. The Campus Master Plan update began with a meeting of the architects and the Steering Committee to provide general planning guidance for the update process. Subsequently, data were gathered from 20 academic departments and 21 administrative departments. In the ensuing consultations and conversations, several alternative rationales for departmental "migrations" were considered, based on space needs, growth potential, possible departmental synergy, and other considerations.

Wednesday, August, 18, 2010. Work Session, Campus Master Plan, MLK Jr Union Building: Brandon Lipman, representing the architectural firm of Loeb, Schlossman, and Hackl presented the details of the updated Campus Master Plan to a group of interested individuals. At that time, the departments migrating to the proposed Science Building were known to be Chemistry and Biology. The materials presented to the group showed that the only departments remaining in PSB were Physics, Psychology, and Geology-Geography. The meeting minutes from this session on Eastern's website continue to show only three departments remaining in PSB. Based on the minutes of this meeting and the tabular and graphic information still located on Eastern's website, there was no discussion of Nursing's movement to PSB.

Tuesday, September 28, 2010. Faculty Senate meeting: Brandon Lipman of Loeb, Schlossman, and Hackl was present to describe the process of data gathering and analysis that were the basis for the decisions on the occupants of the proposed science building, as well as the nonmigrating departments (Physics, Psychology, and Geology-Geography) that would continue to remain in PSB. Mary Anne Hanner (Dean COS) described the migration pattern in detail. The Faculty Senate minutes do not include any mention whatsoever of the Nursing Program with regard to any possible migration. In fact, the Nursing Program is not mentioned in any context. The sciences moving to the new building were described by Brandon as the "wet" sciences (Biology and Chemistry), while the sciences remaining in PSB are described as "physical sciences."

Wednesday, October 20, 2010. Final open campus meeting of the Campus Planning Committee: At that meeting, after the presentation, in response to a question by Jim Conwell regarding the current plans for unit migrations, Dean Hanner stated that she and the Provost had decided to move the Nursing program into the Physical Sciences Building. There had been no mention of this particular migration up until that point in the presentation. The current plans for the migrations, as presented on the slides shown at that meeting still indicated only the three previously discussed nonmigrating departments in PSB. When

questioned by Jim Conwell (Professor, Physics Department) about the timing of the decision, and the people with whom there had been consultation, Dean Hanner asserted that “this was not the place or the time” to ask those questions.

Tuesday, October 26, 2010. Sometime in the morning I learned (from Jim Conwell probably) that Nursing was now to be located in PSB, and this had been announced at the final campus wide open meeting of the planning committee.

Tuesday, Oct. 26, 2010. Faculty Senate Meeting: During the Provost’s segment of the Faculty Senate meeting, occurring at approximately 3:45 PM I asked him if the Master Plan now included the migration of Nursing to PSB. He responded affirmatively, and stated that this had been a “sidebar” discussion that had been going on for sometime. I responded that in the discussion and presentation of the Master Plan that the Faculty Senate had heard on September 28, 2010 we had not discussed the migration of Nursing. He responded that there were a “lot of things you didn’t talk about.” He went on to explain that the Nursing program would not take up a lot of space, stating that you could probably put the whole program in the room occupied by the Faculty Senate (Library 4440, approximately 1200 ft<sup>2</sup>). He later used the figure of 2000 sq feet as being ample for Nursing’s needs. I replied that there needed to be a more complete report that detailed the planning and decision process that resulted in this particular migration. The Provost stated that Nursing was the first new program that had been added at Eastern in the last 25 years, and that it needed to have space in a building that was not a residence hall.

Wednesday, October, 27, 2010. Meeting of PSB Chairs with Dean Hanner, Blair Hall 3108: Dean Hanner noted that emotion about the Nursing move to PSB had started ratcheting up beginning on the previous Wednesday. In reality, first, there was plenty of room in the building; second, Nursing’s migration would relieve space issues with kinesiology, who had approximately 1000 majors; and third, the current planning represented more like a conceptual process. For the time being, in order to facilitate the best overall planning process it would be important to “dial down the emotion” (I completely agree with this final sentiment.). During the course of the meeting, Dean Hanner did an assessment of growth potential for the nonmigrating departments and Nursing, and concluded that Nursing could have growth potential, probably to a greater extent than would Physics. Dean Hanner concluded this segment by advising me that Nursing “is pretty firmly settled in the building” at this point.

Friday, October 29, 2010, approximately 10:00 AM. I had a meeting with Jeff Stowell (Faculty Senator, Psychology) in his office to verify some of the times dates and comments that had occurred. Jeff had been in attendance at the final open campus meeting of the Campus Planning Committee, which had occurred on Wednesday, October 20, 2010. Jeff verified the sequence of events that transpired at the meeting as indicated above.

Friday, November 12, 2010, MLK Jr Union Building, Meeting of Council of University Planning and Budgeting (CUPB): The details of the Master Plan Update were presented to the membership of CUPB. I was unable to attend the meeting proper, but President Perry and Vice President Bill Weber graciously and generously discussed the planning and migration process with me after the meeting’s conclusion. President Perry told me that he was operating with the figures that he had been provided (78,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of available space, compared to 72,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of assessed need). That difference should enable Nursing to operate comfortably within PSB. He reiterated a point made by Dean Hanner that it was important to include Nursing with the other sciences, but he also stated that none of the migrations (other than Chemistry and Biology presumably) were necessarily completely tightened down.

**Collision with History:** What were the factors that resulted in such a persistent, extended, and emotional reaction to the movement of one rather small academic unit into one relatively large building, at a time that may be several years in the future, if it occurs at all? I believe the reaction has been fueled by two events that are rooted in the history of the institution. First, when Psychology moved abruptly into PSB, it was a relatively small program consisting of no more than 10 faculty and 100 or so majors, and possibly no graduate programs. Psychology’s growth into a unit consisting of 20 faculty, nearly 500 majors and close to 50 graduate students in two programs was not foreseen, and perhaps could not have been foreseen. Some of the apparent resistance to Nursing’s migration into PSB, I believe, is the result of a fear factor



regarding the uncertainty of growth—and with it, a repetition of the previous time in history when a small unit was abruptly inserted into the building. Second, it is well to keep in mind that the faculty members of the Physics department are acutely aware of the changes in the role of physics within the institution. For example, twenty years ago there were 12 tenured or tenure-track physicists, now there are eight. Most of the space boundaries and allocations within PSB that have changed over these past 20 years, have been at the expense of the Physics Department. It seems plausible that the migration of Chemistry from the building and the resulting “freeing up” of space was viewed in Physics as a chance to be “made whole” again—and Nursing’s insertion would obviously disrupt that process.

**Conclusion:** Based on the facts that I have been able to ascertain and verify, my conclusion is that the planning process that resulted in the migration of the Nursing Program to the Physical Sciences Building is simply “not congruent” with the planning process that established any of the other migrations. This non congruence is evident in at least three following three ways:

1. Non congruence with regard to the amount of time devoted to analyzing the Nursing migration. Other than Nursing, developing the plan for the migrations apparently required at least five months (ie, from March, 2010 to August, 2010). During this time period, I could find only one relatively brief reference to Nursing’s move to Physical Science, in the Campus Master Plan Meeting Notes for June 16, 2010 (under Option 1, which was clearly not the option that was actually adopted). The plan for Nursing’s migration was apparently developed in three weeks (ie somewhere between September 28 to October 20).
2. Non congruence with regard to the number of constituents consulted regarding the migration. Other than Nursing, the migrations were based on a public space-and-needs assessment that was overseen by the 25 members of the Executive Committee and the Steering Committee. To carry out this analysis, during the Spring 2010 time-frame, the principals of the architectural firm met with representatives in each of the other migrating departments. With regard to Provost Lord’s comment about the “sidebar” discussion on Nursing’s migration, that discussion may have occurred with the other 24 members of the Steering or Executive Committee, but there did not appear to be any discussion with the non migrating departments in PSB.
3. Non congruence with regard to the rationale offered for the other migrations. In the Campus Master Plan Meeting Notes for June 16, 2010, there were several migration options considered for each of the departments involved, based on a number of factors including assessed and needed space, synergy, growth potential, and other possibly other factors. Given the relative infrequency of any comments about Nursing, it is difficult to establish the precise reason for putting the program into PSB. None of the three options laid out at the June 16 meeting were adopted wholesale (that is, the Updated Campus Master Plan in its current form is not completely congruent with any of the three options offered at the June 16 meeting). However, the stated rationale for the Nursing program’s migration into PSB (To bring the Nursing program into a building that “belongs to” COS), is not congruent with the likelihood of growth assessment.

**Final Comments:** First, my intention here is to report on the *process* that was used to determine the Nursing Program’s migration, not the *content* of that decision-making. I am agnostic about the final correct location of the Nursing Program, which could well be in PSB, pending an analysis that is more congruent with that of the other migrations. Second, I intended this report to be focused on *fact-finding*, not *fault-finding*. If any part of it seems accusatory, I apologize in advance. Moreover, I hope this report is not construed as a complete accounting of the planning process that resulted in Nursing’s migration to PSB, no doubt there are other facts that could be brought to bear. Third and finally, it should be noted that everybody with whom I spoke about this matter (including every member of the administration with whom I was in contact) showed me nothing but congenial and respectful cooperation for my attempt to verify the facts of the planning process. I am very thankful for that.