

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Regular Meeting, 26 September 2017, 4:00 p.m.
Capitol Rooms - University Union

ACTION MINUTES

SENATORS PRESENT: M. Allison, B. Bellott, V. Boynton, S. Czechowski, G. Delany-Barmann, R. Hironimus-Wendt, A. Hyde (via teleconference), N. Lino, B. Locke, H. McIlvaine-Newsad, K. Pawelko, B. Perabo, J. Plos, R. Porter (via teleconference), S. Rahman, T. Roberts, S. Rock, M. Sajewski, F. Tasdan, T. Westerhold
Ex-officio: Kathy Neumann, Interim Provost; Tej Kaul, Parliamentarian

SENATORS ABSENT: S. Macchi, D. Sandage, C. Tarrant

GUESTS: Chandra Amaravadi, Lori Baker-Sperry, Davison Bideshi, Katrina Daytner, Christopher Ginn, Terri Hare, Keith Holz, Angela Lynn, Madison Lynn, Sara Lytle, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Russ Morgan, Nancy Parsons, Ron Pettigrew, Roger Runquist, Diana Strom, Bill Thompson, Ron Williams

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. September 12, 2017

Correction: At the bottom of p.11, Ms. Zellmer won the first ballot and Dr. Banash won the election to fill the second at-large seat (Boynton).

MINUTES APPROVED AS CORRECTED

II. Announcements

A. Approvals from the Provost

1. Request for New Course

a. CHEM 114, Chemistry of Health, 3 s.h.

2. Request for New Minor

a. Instructional Design

B. Provost's Report

Interim Provost Neumann related that Thursday, September 14 featured the Town and Gown celebration, including the unveiling of the new Rocky statues, and College of Arts and Sciences Dean Sue Martinelli-Fernandez delivering the Hallwas Lecture on the Macomb campus. Yesterday's (Sept. 25) celebration of Founder's Day was held in the Sherman Hall Auditorium and included a performance by the WIU Choir, a surprise flash mob, and a speech by Senator Kirk Dillard, who Interim Provost Neumann described as a devoted alum with good things to say. Founder's Day was held on the Quad Cities campus this morning (Sept. 26); Senator Dillard was also the featured speaker for that event. Interim Provost Neumann encourages everyone to try to attend a Founder's Day celebration in the future.

Interim Provost Neumann recognized the death of College of Arts and Sciences Development Director Bryce Dexter. She stated that his death is a big loss to the University and the Macomb community and expressed her sympathy to his family.

The We Care campus beautification effort began this afternoon in preparation for alumni returning to Macomb for Homecoming.

Interim Provost Neumann announced that a few accreditation visits have been occurring; Counselor Education had a visit last week, Engineering will be visited this week, and more are scheduled in the near future. She is starting to hear a lot of good feedback already.

The Board of Trustees will meet on the Macomb campus on Friday, September 29. Also on Friday, the new statue of Rock Hanson will be unveiled near the north entrance to Hanson Field. Interim Provost Neumann stated that Art professor Duke Oursler has done a fantastic job creating the statue. Homecoming festivities continue on Saturday with the 5K run/1.5 mile walk at 8 a.m. and the parade at 10:30 a.m. Former Vice President for Administrative Services Jackie Thompson and her husband Dave have been named Grand Marshalls for the parade; Mrs. Thompson worked at WIU over 40 years. A cookout will be held in Q Lot from 12:00-3:00 p.m., just prior to the WIU Homecoming game, and Starlifter (the United States Air Force of Mid-America's pop band) will perform during tailgating.

Interim Provost Neumann recognized that many departments are hosting visiting faculty and alumni this week. She encourages departments and faculty to reconnect with alums, encourage them to come back to talk to classes, and discuss with them opportunities they may be able to afford WIU's current students.

C. Student Government Association Report
(Madison Lynn, SGA representative to Faculty Senate)

- Ms. Lynn met with Director of Admissions Seth Miner last week. She related that Mr. Miner hopes SGA members can help with future Discover Western programs.
- SGA President Grant Reed and Ms. Lynn have created a survey on Purple Post regarding dining in the University Union and in academic buildings. The survey will post tomorrow.
- Tonight's SGA meeting was cancelled to allow members to attend Homecoming activities.

D. Other Announcements

1. "Spring for Books" Textbook Award Initiative
(Ron Pettigrew, Academic Advisor, Bachelor of General Studies, and Sara Lytle, Director, College of Business and Technology Advising)

Chairperson Rock stated that the Executive Committee has had discussions recently about a number of students on campus who do not have the funds to buy books or supplies. He related that, in addition to investigating the Spring for Books scholarship, ExCo also plans to follow up on an issue that came up a few years ago of creating an institutional grant writer to for the University.

Ms. Lytle related that the Council of Academic Advisors (COAA) has taken the lead in promoting the Spring for Books scholarship. She stated that advisors frequently interact with students about hardships they might be encountering and know how critical it is for them to obtain textbooks to be successful. This is the second year that textbook scholarships will be awarded.

Students may apply for the scholarships from October 15 through December 1. All full-time students are eligible. Financial need is prioritized, and students must have filed their FAFSA. Applications can be obtained from academic advisors or on the Scholarship Office website. Ms. Lytle stated that COAA completes its selection process in early December so that students can know if they have the additional funds before spring semester. COAA hopes to be able to award \$200 to \$250 per student and will make as many awards as possible with the amount of money raised. Information about the scholarships has been sent out via TeleSTARS inviting the campus to donate via payroll deduction, by texting spring4books to the number 41444, or by filling out a 60-second donation form online at <http://bit.ly/spring4books>.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt expressed his thanks for the Council's efforts. He added that the Department of Sociology and Anthropology also offers a \$250 book award for a senior who has performed community service and is willing to write an essay about that service.

Senator Boynton asked if there is a "spring4books" for the fall semester. Ms. Lytle replied that this is just a spring program, but the COAA hopes that it can grow to be expanded into the fall at some point. She explained that sometimes the cost of college exceeds what students and their families have planned for or students may expend all of their college funds in fall, so the book award money is helpful in spring when available funds to purchase textbooks may be depleted. Senator Perabo asked if reminders could be sent to Building Connections mentors about the scholarship since they will be meeting with their students after midterm grades go out.

Senator Roberts asked if the students receive the money or if it is applied toward credit at the University Union Bookstore. Ms. Lytle replied that currently the money is direct deposited to students; it can be used for textbooks, clickers, online codes, or other supplies. She added that COAA may investigate going through the Bookstore in future. Senator Roberts stated he would prefer that students who receive the awards have lots of leeway as to how they use it.

Mr. Pettigrew told senators that GPA is also a factor in determining which students receive the scholarships; normally, a 2.5 GPA is the minimum for the award. Chairperson Rock asked what percentage of applicants are able to receive a book award. Mr. Pettigrew replied that 20 to 25 scholarships for \$200 to \$250 apiece were given out for the past two years, but more contributions would enable the Council to give out more. Senator Czechowski asked if students need to submit receipts for their purchases; Ms. Lytle replied that they do not. She added that academic advisors work with students and sometimes receive thank you notes from them for receiving the awards; there is no formalized process, but most students do seem to communicate about what they use the funds for. Mr. Pettigrew added that the Scholarship Office encourages students to send thank yous for the awards they receive. He stated that there is a detailed process for applying for the scholarship, so it is evident that students have done some reflection; this year, students must make a statement telling how the funds would benefit them, and these testimonials were used in advertising the scholarship.

Senator Allison recalled that departments used to be eligible to receive a book award for their students if they turned in their book orders to the Union Bookstore by the deadline. She asked if this scholarship still exists. Director of Financial Aid Terri Hare replied that it is her understanding that this is no longer offered; it was not through Financial Aid or the Scholarship Office but through the Bookstore, and she has not heard anything about it recently.

Chairperson Rock asked if there are other sources of funds that students can tap to purchase books and supplies. Ms. Lytle replied that the President offers a book award, another one is available for transfer students, and there are various other areas that offer them. Ms. Hare stated that every student who files their FAFSA on the first day it is available, October 1, is automatically eligible for a book award. Financial Aid randomly selects 50 students that file on that date to receive the award. She added that the President at Discover Western gives out book awards to a certain number of students that email or tweet him; those are also random and are not targeted or have any criteria. She stated that sometimes donors also set up book scholarships that are awarded through Foundations.

2. [MyWestern Portal](#)
(Roger Runquist, Director, Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research)

Chairperson Rock told senators that Faculty Senate has been asked to provide some information on the software that students use, such as www.wiu.edu/MyWestern. Dr. Runquist explained that, as part of a persistence and completion initiative by Dean Martinelli-Fernandez, the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (CITR) thought it would be useful to create a way for students to find some of the resources available to them in one place. MyWestern is a mobile website that brings together resources across campus in categories that are quick to understand and access. Dr. Runquist stated that CITR is able to update very quickly if a new link needs to be added, and students can remove navigation links that they do not think they need. If students are logged in, they can use links specific to them, such as seeing who their advisor is or their schedule for the semester. There are also links to take students to tutoring resources, absence reporting, the Counseling Center, the student handbook, scholarships, Parking Services, or Purple Post, among others.

Parliamentarian Kaul asked if a link to MyWestern can be provided on Western Online so that each student can be made aware of it; Dr. Runquist replied that is a good idea, and he will follow up on it. He also asked senators to let him know if there are categories that should be added to the website because he wants it to be as effective as possible.

Senator Delany-Barmann asked if there is a link that would show students how much they have left in their accounts or where they can find funding. Dr. Runquist replied that it is hard to get student-specific information from the mainframe, but there is a link to take students to the Financial Aid office. Senator Bellott remarked that it is nice to see the Purple Post included on the list of links.

3. Chairperson Rock introduced Tara Westerhold, Economics and Decision Sciences, who won the recent election to represent the College of Business and Technology on Faculty Senate for the 2017-18 academic year.
4. Senator Boynton announced that University Libraries professor Linda Zellmer has been chosen as the 2017 recipient of the Distinguished Service Award from the Geoscience Information Society.

Motion: To reorder the agenda to consider III.B., Council for International Education, before III.A., which would then be followed by V.C., Discussion of Board of Trustees agenda (Allison/Boynton)

MOTION APPROVED 19 YES – 0 NO – 1 AB

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

B. Council for International Education (CIE) (Reordered)
(Davison Bideshi, Interim Chair)

1. Revised Goals and Objectives
2. Revised Policies and Procedures

Computer Sciences professor Chandra Amaravadi, who chaired CIE last year, related that the Council was in the process of reviewing Global Issues (GI) courses in spring 2016 when they decided that their previously established criteria was insufficient for the review. Dr. Amaravadi talked about this problem with the Executive Committee last year, and CIE worked to make their goals and objectives more concrete, added them to the existing CIE policies and procedures, which were also revised, and created a form that could be used by CIE members to evaluate existing GI courses.

Senator Boynton asked if GI course objectives in the document refer to General Education Global Issues and DSGI course objectives refer to Discipline-Specific Global Issues; Dr. Amaravadi confirmed this is correct. He added that generally GI courses are 100- and 200-

level while DSGI courses are upper level. CIE was advised to spell these acronyms out in the document. Senator Rahman remarked that the course objectives are very similar for both types of courses. Dr. Amaravadi stated that GI courses typically involve more critical study because they apply to a particular area. Senator Rahman pointed out that engaging in a critical study of globalization as it applies to the field of study is an objective for both the Gen Ed GI and the DSGI courses. Dr. Amaravadi asserted that CIE is not concerned about General Education because GI courses can be in accounting, for example, which is not a General Education subject and would be studied from the perspective of that field of study. Senator Rahman stated that if one type of GI course is primarily 100- to 200-level and the other is 300- to 400-level, she would expect to see more differences in their course objectives.

Senator Allison pointed out that it is her understanding that there are two types of GI courses, one of which is also Gen Ed. Senator Boynton added that the Foreign Language/Global Issues (FLGI) requirement also encompasses study abroad and foreign language study. She noted that even Gen Ed courses are taught within a field of study; a History Gen Ed course would be different than one taught in English. Senator Bellott pointed out that the General Education GI course objective states “Engage in a critical study of globalization as it applies to the field of study, supported with academic content,” while the similar Discipline-Specific GI course objective adds the word “in-depth” before critical study. Senator Rahman observed that the phrase “field of study” was not included in the course objectives as originally written.

Parliamentarian Kaul noted that CIE in future will be evaluating GI courses that were created and approved under the previous guidelines. He asked if CIE would be evaluating existing courses under the original guidelines or under the new guidelines, once those are approved by the Senate. He wonders how CIE will proceed if the process exposes a problem in regard to how the courses were approved originally versus using the new guidelines. Dr. Amaravadi said this is a good question. He related that CIE’s thinking was that the new guidelines would be applied to all new courses (created after the revised guidelines are approved), while courses that are already on the books would be reviewed every five years, and CIE would work with departments to help existing courses meet the revised guidelines. Parliamentarian Kaul suggested that once the new guidelines are approved, they should be sent to department chairs, who should be informed that their GI courses will be up for review on a certain date in the cycle and that they will be judged under the new guidelines. He added that faculty need to know which guidelines to follow when teaching a GI course and when they are to be evaluated by CIE. Dr. Amaravadi agreed this is an excellent point. He stated that CIE had thought it was the administration’s responsibility to do this, but it might be better for CIE to inform departments with plenty of advance notice so that they can start working on their courses. Dr. Bideshi remarked that even existing courses could, without a lot of work, be made to fit into the proposed new criteria. He thinks the updates could be done very quickly. Parliamentarian Kaul stressed that it is very important for faculty teaching GI courses to know whether they are in compliance with the requirements and whether they are to comply with the existing guidelines or with the new ones; departments need to know what goals are to be assessed and when that will occur. Dr. Bideshi suggested that CIE could tell departments what the existing guidelines are and that the next time they are evaluated it will be under the new guidelines.

Senator Bellott asked if “field of study” refers to the class or to the field of study of the student; if a Chemistry student takes a History class, for example, is the field of study History or Chemistry. Dr. Amaravadi replied that it refers to the course. Senator Bellott suggested that this be clarified. Senator Locke agreed that the first use of “field of study” seems to refer to the course, but he noted that objective #4 under DSGI – “Demonstrate an ability to draw informed insights into a global situation as it pertains to the field of study and country of comparison” – seems to refer to the student’s field of study.

Senator Bellott asked if there is a rubric that will be applied to see if a course meets the criteria. Dr. Amaravadi explained that two evaluators from CIE along with the CIE Chair will form a team to evaluate existing GI courses. Senator Bellott expressed his concern that one year a GI course could meet the requirements under a certain CIE team and the next time the course is evaluated it might not meet the criteria if there is no rubric. Dr. Amaravadi explained that there are too many criteria to make a rubric, and it would be very hard to determine a single formula for all GI courses.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt expressed his appreciation for the amount of work that CIE put into revising their documents. He stated, however, that he will object to the report because he would rather see it go back to CIE to include those changes that have been discussed by senators. He stressed that he is objecting for that reason and not because he is dismissing the amount of work CIE has put into the documents. Senator Hironimus-Wendt noted that FLGI is a graduation requirement, not a Gen Ed requirement, but he is struggling with the idea of telling students that they can take an in-depth or a not-in-depth course with the only difference being whether the course is discipline-specific. He thinks this is very weak language, and that a graduation requirement should certify that every graduate of WIU is proficient to the same level rather than to two different levels. Senator Hironimus-Wendt believes that the new document is so different than the existing one that he would be opposed to grandfathering existing courses that do not meet the new requirements. He thinks that students who graduate in the future having completed the FLGI requirement should all be on the same page in regard to their proficiencies. He also thinks that all existing courses should be re-evaluated once the new guidelines are adopted if those guidelines are going to be substantially different.

Senator Allison observed that both of the second course objectives (for GEGI and DSGI) talk about “multiple continents or culturally and politically distinct regions within the same continent.” She asked if North America is excluded; Dr. Amaravadi replied that North America is not excluded. Senator Allison asked if a North American course could be considered global issues; Dr. Bideshi replied that courses on Canada or Mexico could be considered global issues.

Senator Roberts remarked that there is some redundancy in the criteria by which a global issues course is evaluated in #1 and #9 on the GI Course Evaluation Form. The first question asks how the GI perspective is provided while question #9 asks how the student demonstrates skills in dealing with GI issues, and the two questions use almost exactly the same list of choices. He asked if one of those questions could be changed to have CIE look at the course in terms of geographic region rather than the skills demonstrated because there is nothing on the evaluation form directing CIE to look at where in the world the course is focused. Chairperson Rock pointed out that questions #2 and #3 ask if the GI perspective is provided by studying certain countries, what countries and cultures are studied, and if the countries are on separate continents. Dr. Amaravadi explained that question #1 focuses on how the content is provided while #9 focuses on what the student gets out of the course. Senator Roberts asserted that instructors should know how many of the categories (listed under each question) they need to fulfill before they submit their work so that they can know if they are in the range of what will be approved. Dr. Amaravadi stated that if a professor is conforming to the overall GI requirements, there should be no problem, but if only the first four weeks of a course is devoted to global issues, for example, then it will probably not meet the guidelines because the majority of GI courses should have global issues content. Dr. Bideshi remarked that question #10 – which asks what percentage of the course grade are the GI assignments/projects, taken in aggregate – addresses, in some level, what Senator Roberts is asking.

Senator Roberts asked if 60 percent is the threshold; Dr. Bideshi replied that it is. Senator Roberts asked if a course could fulfill many categories but still not be approved if global issues do not comprise 60 percent or more of the class. Dr. Amaravadi replied that the department chair could petition to CIE in this case to explain why these criteria are not

being followed and provide a justification. Dr. Bideshi added that this is the first time CIE is trying this type of evaluation, and the process will likely be refined as the Council works through it.

Senator Rahman asked what types of international education or experience are sought for members of CIE; Dr. Amaravadi responded that this is not determined by the Council. [Note: This definition of membership is from the Senate Bylaws.] Chairperson Rock asked Senator Boynton if the Senate Nominating Committee looks for faculty with international education or experience when they fill vacancies on CIE. Senator Boynton replied that when faculty indicate their interest in serving on CIE on the interest survey, they are asked to also indicate their international education or experience.

Senator Rahman said she has always thought of global issues courses as being outside the United States, but she wonders if countries where English is the primary language, such as Great Britain or Canada, would still be considered eligible for global issues. Dr. Amaravadi replied that cultures must be distinct, more than two cultures must be studied, and there must be some contrast made between the cultures to qualify for global issues designation.

Senator Boynton observed that FLGI was designed as a variable graduation requirement since students can meet it in a number of ways – through taking a course designated as General Education Global Issues or Discipline-specific Global Issues, by participating in a study abroad experience, or by taking a foreign language course – so it has always been a bit of a hodgepodge. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that it would be more accurate to refer to the two types of GI courses as discipline-specific and non-discipline-specific because FLGI is not a Gen Ed requirement. Senator Boynton observed that the GEGI courses are General Education courses with a GI designation; Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that he still thinks his language would be better.

Senator Delany-Barmann suggested that #2 under Goals – “Articulate how global society is influenced by different histories, cultures, economies, religions, philosophies or professional practices, among other influences” – be changed to add “languages” before the word “cultures.”

Parliamentarian Kaul remarked that global issues courses were intended to be distinctly different than multicultural or cross-cultural courses, which are expected to focus on issues within the United States while GI courses address topics outside of the U.S. He asked if CIE has given thought to differentiating GI courses from multicultural and cross-cultural courses. Dr. Amaravadi replied that in spring 2017, CIE was approached by the Council on General Education to discuss these differences. He stated that CIE concluded that the difference is mainly in the fact that multicultural courses focus on different cultures within a country while global issues compares cultures across countries, but this is not a hard and fast definition. Parliamentarian Kaul suggested some sort of preamble describing these differences be added to the CIE policies and procedures so that it becomes something that departments developing new courses, or those with existing global issues courses, can better understand because there is much confusion regarding this difference. Senator Boynton believes that the confusion seems to be more on the multicultural than on the global issues side since global issues includes in its Goals an understanding that “we live in an interconnected global society.”

Registrar Angela Lynn related that in 2015, when the FLGI requirement was changed to allow courses to transfer in with GI credit, there was a lot of analysis done about the overlap between Gen Ed and GI courses because every time FLGI is discussed there is a huge debate, no matter how small the change, and it is still a very controversial subject. At that time, it was found that 81 percent of GI courses are also General Education courses in the Multicultural category, so there is a lot of overlap. She pointed out that the undergraduate catalog states as one option for fulfilling the FLGI requirement that

“Students earn credit for a General Education course that is designated as Global Issues.” She listed some of the courses that are approved for both GEGI and Gen Ed Multicultural: Introduction to Cultural Anthropology (ANTH 110), World Regional Geography (GEOG 110), The Holocaust (HIST 337), Music in World Cultures (MUS 394), Introduction to Eastern Religions (REL 110), Islam (REL 365), Women: A Global Perspective (WS 285). Dr. Lynn pointed out that there is nothing specific about North America being excluded. She explained that when the FLGI requirement was created, some departments wanted a foreign language requirement and others did not, and there were a large number of programs that were already at 120 s.h. with no room for electives. She explained this is why it was decided to allow for double dipping between Gen Ed and GI courses, and this has been operationalized so that students do not have to go over 120 hours in order to add the FLGI requirement. Senator Rahman recalled that before the FLGI requirement was established, there were only Gen Ed Multicultural courses, and that category was huge and broad because individuals were trying to include a lot of things into that category. She observed that WIU now has GI courses and wants them to be different than multicultural, but the reason there is so much overlap is because the multicultural courses are older. She suggested that the way to think about these courses now is to think about them together.

SENATOR HIRONIMUS-WENDT OBJECTED TO THE REPORT

Chairperson Rock observed that the Senate does not seem to be ready to approve the CIE report. Senator Hironimus-Wendt would like to see the report sent back to CIE for further modification and for the Council to return a clean copy. Chairperson Rock asked if there were any objections to sending the report back to CIE.

NO OBJECTIONS

A. Committee on Provost and Presidential Performance (CPPP)
(Robert Hironimus-Wendt, Chair)

1. Discussion on Shortening the Surveys of the President and the Provost

Senator Hironimus-Wendt related that the CPPP met last week, and the suggestion was raised by two members that it would be helpful to substantially shorten the survey from approximately 30 to 40 minutes to about ten minutes. He stated that this would involve substantial revision and elimination of some questions, but some members thought that if the survey was simpler and shorter it would enhance faculty participation. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that the Committee is not making a proposal at this time but wanted to present the idea for discussion on the Senate floor.

Senator Westerhold related that when she served on the CPPP a few years ago, this same discussion was raised. She related that not only did it take a long time to complete the survey, but some questions were not instinctive and many were ones that the average faculty member could not answer. She added that CPPP that year added the different “not applicable” options to address this problem. Senator Westerhold observed that at the end of the process, the CPPP Chair meets with the President and Provost to get feedback on the survey results, and Provost Hawkinson at that time felt that if the survey was shortened quite a bit and the questions made more conceptual in terms of overarching general responsibilities, the Committee would get better feedback. She stated that Provost Hawkinson gave CPPP what he thought would be the top 20 questions that should be included on the survey. She recognizes that redoing the entire survey will take a lot of time and effort. Senator Boynton added that reducing the survey will also potentially affect the year-to-year comparisons and will make it harder to do long-term comparisons.

Senator Roberts, who served as CPPP Chair last year, thinks if CPPP’s intention is to encourage greater faculty participation, then perhaps the survey is too long. But he does not think there is an understanding among faculty of how the survey findings are used,

which may not be addressed by shortening the survey because that may be an unrelated issue. He suspects that faculty skepticism leads them to feel that filling out the survey, no matter what its length, is not a good use of their time. Senator Czechowski expressed agreement with Senator Roberts and said she also feels this way when filling out evaluations for chairs and deans. She stated that faculty spend a lot of time on the written responses but do not see any changes from the results so do not fill them out in future. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that Faculty Senate conducts the survey for the Board of Trustees rather than for the University. Senator Czechowski asked if faculty ever get to find out the results. Senator Hironimus-Wendt replied that the results are presented to the President and Provost, then to the Senate, and then forwarded to the BOT; the report is one bit of data for the BOT to use to determine whether to retain, fire, or offer a pay raise to the President and Provost.

Senator Perabo supports the idea of shortening the survey and wonders if it would be possible to retain 25 of the questions. She has taken surveys where the individual is asked to answer five questions and then is given the option to answer an additional 20, for example, if he or she knows a lot about that particular area or interacts frequently with the person being evaluated. She would like to see more participation in the survey and thinks it would help if it took faculty ten minutes to complete the survey rather than 30. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad, who serves on CPPP, explained that it is the Committee's intention to retain the core of the survey, the questions that provide the most information or which the Committee deems are the most meaningful. She believes, however, that the survey in its current format is "a huge mess." Senator McIlvaine-Newsad stated that, although she does not write surveys for a living, she takes a lot of them, and the current evaluation survey frustrates her because it seems to be never-ending. She believes it would be helpful to revise the survey to make it more manageable.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if permission would have to be asked of the BOT if the survey is changed; Chairperson Rock replied that this would not be necessary since Faculty Senate is independent of the BOT. Senator Roberts observed that the survey is used by the Board of Trustees. Interim Provost Neumann stated that the BOT does not tell Faculty Senate how to revise its instruments. Senator Roberts stated that it was his understanding that Faculty Senate is charged by the BOT to conduct the survey; Senator Hironimus-Wendt agreed that was his understanding as well, and at some point the survey was revised to reflect the goals and objectives of the President and Provost. The Recording Secretary, to provide a historical context, related that before the survey was created, the Board of Trustees every year would ask the Faculty Senate Chair to provide input for them to use when evaluating the University President. Approximately 15 years ago, the Senate Chair expressed discomfort with evaluating the President on his own, and Faculty Senate created the CPPP to survey the faculty to provide broader input to the Board. She stated that the BOT did not ask Faculty Senate to conduct a survey; they asked the Senate Chair to provide his personal input on behalf of the entire faculty about whether he thought the President was doing a good job, and the Chair did not feel comfortable speaking on behalf of the entire faculty without their additional input.

Senator Allison agrees with Senator Perabo that it would be nice to have a survey where the individual answers a few questions and, if desired, can then answer more along the same line. She feels beaten down by the current survey when she has to respond "not applicable" to so many questions. She thinks the problem stems from faculty not feeling that they are getting anything out of completing the survey and believing that the survey does not benefit them personally so there is no reason to complete it. Senator Allison knows what the outcome is when someone evaluates her and can respond to it, but she does not know the outcome or see any response from the survey of the President and Provost.

Parliamentarian Kaul pointed out that the Board of Trustees requests a report but do not tell the Faculty Senate how that report is to be generated or what instruments to use in

generating it. Senator Czechowski asked if job descriptions are used in any way for the evaluations. Senator Hironimus-Wendt responded that the survey was originally conceived to reflect the President's job description but was modified six to eight years ago to reflect more of the President's and Provost's goals and objectives for the year rather than their job descriptions.

Senator Czechowski asked if any research has been done regarding peer institutions and what their evaluations look like. Senator Roberts responded that when he was chair CPPP looked at how peer institutions evaluated their presidents. Senator Czechowski asked how similar WIU's evaluation is to that of peer institutions. Senator Roberts responded that WIU's evaluation is more in-depth and more frequent than what peer institutions undertake. Senator Czechowski remarked that student evaluations take five to ten minutes to complete; each department is responsible for creating the evaluation, and then the document goes through an approval process. She noted that most student evaluations are comprised of 20 questions and an opportunity for response. She pointed out that student evaluations specify what is done with the responses and how they are used, and she thinks this piece needs to be added to the evaluations of the Provost and President.

Senator Roberts asked if the Faculty Senate is conducting the survey more at the request of the Senate Chair than at the request of the Board of Trustees; Parliamentarian Kaul pointed out that the Board will ask the Senate Chair every year for his or her input as to the President's performance, and the Senate Chair wants a way to include the input of the entire faculty in the response. Senator Roberts asked if the BOT had ever asked the Faculty Senate specifically for a survey; the Recording Secretary responded that they had not done so to her knowledge. Senator Rahman stated that perhaps a survey is not that important; what is important is that the faculty have a way of telling the chair what they think about the President's performance, and it could be in the form of a narrative. Parliamentarian Kaul pointed out that it would be difficult to quantify or summarize that many opinions given to one person. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad added that analysis could be conducted in this case but it would be very time consuming. Senator Boynton pointed out that analysis has to be conducted on the comments anyway, and the President, after he is briefed on the report, has the opportunity to come to a Senate meeting to respond. She asked if the evaluation summary is posted on the Senate website; Chairperson Rock confirmed that it is.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt observed that he gets the sense that the body would not mind if the Committee reduced the survey to 20 closed-ended questions and tried to retain the spirit of the open-ended questions so that individuals could write their own narrative. He will take this back to the next CPPP meeting as the Senate's charge. He stated that the Committee will meet next week and hopes to have the survey completed soon so that they can come back to Faculty Senate in the near future with a revised version.

V. New Business (*Reordered*)

C. Discussion of Board of Trustees Agenda for September 29 Meeting (*Reordered*)

Chairperson Rock informed senators that he is allowed only a few minutes to address the Board of Trustees (BOT) at their meeting, but he is happy to pass along the will of the Senate. Senator Boynton pointed out that p. 36 of the BOT agenda states that "Consistent with the University's Strategic Plan, salary increases are the University's highest priority," and on p. 37 it is stated that "Such actions in the competitive job market necessitate faculty and staff salaries that meet and exceed the mean of peer institutions." She asked how the three percent annual pay cut that is being proposed by WIU's administration fits with the desire of the BOT to exceed the salaries of peer institutions because salary increases are the highest priority. Chairperson Rock explained that the budget that WIU submits goes to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), along with those from other state universities. He stated that, after digesting the information submitted from all institutions, the IBHE usually makes a somewhat one-size-fits-all budget recommendation to the

state legislature, which the legislature will probably ignore. He believes that it is nice that the BOT included salary increases as a goal, but the reality is that is not what is being discussed in the current ongoing negotiations. Chairperson Rock had already planned to point out to the BOT the disconnect between their proposed salary increases for faculty and the administration's proposals to continue furloughs, make the three percent salary decrease permanent, and increase course loads. Senator Boynton pointed out that there is also a disconnect on p. 100 with the BOT's and the administrations positions regarding salary minima. Chairperson Rock observed that, should the IBHE forward on the BOT's recommendations and the state legislature agree to these goals, it would likely color what goes on in negotiations between the administration and faculty.

Senator Allison finds the BOT's language really striking and fully supportive. She asked Chairperson Rock to tell the BOT that faculty support this idea that their salary increases are the highest priority; if that is the BOT's goal and aspiration, that says something very significant, and Senator Allison applauds it.

Senator Bellott understands this document is for the BOT to give to the IBHE, but he wonders if it is also used by the administration to guide their goals and priorities because he thinks it should also be used to administer the University. Chairperson Rock expressed his agreement.

Senator Delany-Barmann echoed the concern about the disconnect and applauded the BOT for wanting the University's highest priority to be salaries and maintaining minima because maintaining the quality of the faculty and the institution is very important. Senator Hironimus-Wendt echoed what has been said so far and added that to date he has been very disappointed in the way contract negotiations have played out, with the two sides presenting seemingly polar opposite perspectives and not finding middle ground. He hopes the final contract that is offered reaches that middle and does not include proposals to eliminate minima for senior faculty and withdraw three percent of faculty salaries. He hopes the union and administration work diligently to reach a common good because it brings down the institution to have these discussions play out over time.

Senator Czechowski observed that by saying faculty salaries are the highest priority and minima is also important, the BOT is saying that WIU's faculty are the heart and soul of WIU and actually putting credibility behind its words, and she thinks it would be great to have this come across. She noted that faculty have had decreases in their salaries, have been laid off and rehired, and morale is at an all-time low. She told senators that reading the document from the BOT shows they support the faculty, which is perhaps a change from where previous support has been, and she does not think this can be stressed enough.

Besides salaries, Senator Pawelko wishes that mediation, the BOT document, and other discussions would take into consideration things such as the lack of a travel budget, conference support, registration expenses, etc. She added that things are also going on behind the scenes in departments, such as faculty stepping up to fund scholarships so that the tradition of disbursing departmental scholarships can continue despite the lack of Foundation money in certain accounts. Other miscellaneous fees have also come up which faculty have absorbed, but this has not been taken into consideration because those types of things happen behind the scenes. She stated that faculty have voluntarily stepped up, but she hopes that this is short-term and not an ongoing dilemma because to be slapped with a salary decrease would result in continued demoralization.

Senator Allison stated the kind of language included in the BOT document gives her hope, and that is not just based on economics. She feels bad for building service workers that have been cut, but she is also not in favor of faculty having to pick up the work that these employees formerly accomplished. She observed that departmental offices are no longer being vacuumed, and that looks bad to students. Senator Allison is starting to have to empty her own trash as well as the trash in classrooms and public spaces, and she finds it demoralizing that she is expected to not only teach but also to clean the building. She believes this affects how WIU is viewed by others.

Senator Perabo added her support to what others have said. She wonders where the peer institutions are that WIU is expected to meet and exceed the mean of and where WIU's salaries currently stand in relation to them; she would like to know what the comparable salaries at peer institutions are and whether WIU meeting or exceeding any of them. Senator Perabo also remarked on the BOT's statement that "Recruiting and retaining high-achieving and diverse faculty and staff are directly related to improving the quality of academic and co-curricular programs and services." She wonders what the impact will be of telling current faculty that they are to make three percent less and what message it sends to faculty being recruited if WIU is the kind of institution that has reduced faculty salaries and would like to reduce them much more. Chairperson Rock asked if University Professionals of Illinois (UPI) President Bill Thompson could address the question about peer groups. Dr. Thompson explained that contractual peer groups are listed on the Institutional Research and Planning website under Resources, and that listing has not changed. He stated that, using AAUP data, the top two faculty ranks are at peer, but Assistant Professors are about \$5,000 below peer, and Associate Professors and Instructors are \$5,000 to \$7,000 down. Dr. Thompson added that what is keeping WIU at peer have been the minima and Professional Achievement Awards (PAA) because faculty at WIU have had very few raises that would have kept faculty salaries at peer.

Senator Pawelko believes that WIU's administration and Board of Trustees should be aware that salaries are already having a corrosive effect on attracting new faculty and chairs. She stated that since WIU has been in this cycle for several years, there has been a time lag; in some instances, the University has lost faculty with certain credentials that are essential to external accreditation bodies, for example. She pointed out that if appropriate faculty resources are not available, it has a demonstrable impact on student recruitment when departments have to tell potential students that a certain program or option is unavailable because of the lack of qualified faculty. Senator Pawelko noted that certain departments are down faculty due to retirements or leaving the University, and over the past couple of years this is starting to "catch up with us."

Senator Delany-Barmann remarked that on the topic of lost faculty, the amendment sent out by the Board of Trustees today added to its budget a request for "Restoration of budget reductions (\$5,144,500) to restore important positions, reestablish technology and academic initiatives, and to support general operating increases." Senator Delany-Barmann pointed out that there remains one tenured faculty member who has not been offered back her job at WIU. She added that this individual is a qualified faculty member who is valued by her students, and she does not think this individual's salary would make much of a dent in the University's budget. She thinks it would be nice to have this faculty member back at WIU.

Senator Boynton observed that on p. 142, section 3.c. of the BOT materials states that "The Admissions Office will purchase an expanded range of ACT scores and increase communication with these high school juniors and seniors." She asked what the range will encompass and whether this has already occurred or if the expansion will occur in the future. She noted that WIU already purchases the top scores, so she is unsure what the expansion refers to.

Senator Allison asked what "market value" means in the sentence on p. 37 that states "Continued prosperity is contingent upon statewide partnerships committed to investment in fair, equitable, market value faculty and staff salaries." She does not know what market value salaries are and wonders if this is in reference to peer salaries.

Chairperson Rock asked the Senate Recording Secretary to provide him with the comments from the meeting as soon as possible so that he can shape them into a message to the Board of Trustees when they meet on Friday, September 29.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils (*Continued*)

C. Senate Nominating Committee (Ginny Boynton, Chair)

SENATE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES:

Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction

Amy Burke, Comm. Sci. & Disorders replacing Eun Go FA&C Fall 17 only

There were no further nominations, and the candidate was declared elected.

IV. Old Business – None

V. New Business

A. Election of Five Senators to Social Responsibility Task Force for Higher Values in Higher Education Strategic Plan 2017-2027

Chairperson Rock stated that Vice President Rives would like for up to five senators to serve on the Higher Values in Higher Education Social Responsibility Task Force to work on the Strategic Plan for 2017-27. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad had volunteered at the Executive Committee meeting. Senators Hironimus-Wendt, Bellott, Sajewski, and Tasdan also volunteered to serve. [Note: following the meeting, Senator Czechowski also volunteered to serve on this task force, and Vice President Rives approved the six members.]

B. Election of One Senator to Higher Learning Commission Persistence and Completion Academy Steering Team

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked for Dean Martinelli-Fernandez to explain the purpose of this group. Dean Martinelli-Fernandez explained that the committee talks about various initiatives and tries to determine directions for the University to explore to encourage student persistence toward and completion of their degrees. Associate Provost Parsons asked if this position would replace Christopher Pynes, who is no longer on Senate. Chairperson Rock replied that he was asked but declined to serve because he is chairing the Provost Search Committee so would like for a senator to serve in his place.

No senators volunteered to serve on this steering team. This item will be returned to the October 10 agenda under Old Business.

Senator Rahman asked about the discussion at the Executive Committee meeting regarding an institutional grant writer for the University. Chairperson Rock responded that ExCo has invited Janna Deitz and Amy Mossman, who were instrumental in that initiative, to attend the next Faculty Senate meeting to discuss this further. He added the Executive Committee would like to resurrect this discussion and bring it to the forefront. Senator Hironimus-Wendt noted that Senator McIlvaine-Newsad was very instrumental in this initiative as well.

Motion: To adjourn (Tasdan)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

Susan Czechowski, Faculty Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary