

**WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE**

Continuation of Recessed Meeting

**5 December 2017, 4:00 p.m.
Capitol Rooms - University Union**

A C T I O N M I N U T E S

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

SENATORS ABSENT: G. Delany-Barmann, S. Macchi, H. McIlvaine-Newsad

GUESTS: Lori Baker-Sperry, Erik Brooks, Katrina Daytner, Dennis DeVolder, Shay Farley, Wil Gradle, Denise Gravitt, Anita Hardeman, Bob Intrieri, Angela Lynn, Madison Lynn, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Kyle Mayborn, Seth Miner, Russ Morgan, Jill Myers, Nancy Parsons, Renee Polubinsky, Christopher Pynes, Grant Reed, Jeremy Robinette, Elizabeth Swan, Tracy Walters, Ron Williams, Dan Yoder

II. Announcements

D. Other Announcements

3. Faculty Initiatives Process

Chairperson Rock explained that a couple of years ago the Faculty Senate looked for ways that individuals could forward good ideas to the administration without having to go through the chair-dean-provost-consolidated budget report process. The Faculty Senate at that time felt that many faculty get discouraged because good ideas get lost in the process, so the Senate created its own way to gather ideas and pass them forward more quickly. He asked senators to remind constituents that anyone with good ideas to enhance the University or increase revenue can submit them to the Executive Committee, who, if they think they are valuable, will forward them on to the Faculty Senate and then, if approved, to the administration. Chairperson Rock stated that only one faculty initiative has so far gone forward; it involved adding a line to diplomas and was implemented. Senator Boynton asked if the information is available online. Chairperson Rock replied that it is available on the Faculty Senate website but it should probably also be mailed out through the Senate listproc. Senator Czechowski remarked that the Executive Committee had said they wanted to send it out to faculty to bring attention to it. She added that you have to dig to find it on the Senate website.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

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

2. Shortened Provost Survey

Senator Hironimus-Wendt told senators the current Senate Bylaws state that the surveys of the Provost and President will be administered “to all WIU faculty who are eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate.” CPPP had suggested at the last Senate meeting that chairs be allowed to take the survey, but the Bylaws specification has forced a reevaluation of that recommendation. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that CPPP will now share the survey with the Chairs’ Council and let them administer their own surveys if they wish, unless

there is sentiment from the Senate to amend the Bylaws. Senator Allison asked what Senator Hironimus-Wendt means by “share.” Senator Hironimus-Wendt responded that the Chairs’ Council would have access to the Senate’s survey in case they wanted to create their own survey of the President and Provost.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt reminded senators that CPPP’s primary goal was to shorten the surveys to increase faculty participation. The new version of the Provost survey would have 27 informational questions, rather than 40, along with a few other questions about gender, reporting college, etc. CPPP will add “Other” as a choice of response for the gender question, in addition to “Man” and “Woman.” Senator Allison asked if it would not be better for the choices to be “Male,” “Female,” and “Other.” Senator Hironimus-Wendt replied that this could be debated, but as a sociologist he thinks in terms of gender categories rather than sex categories. He stated that the issue is one of gender identity, which is Man, Woman, Transgender Man, Transgender Woman, and Other, while Male/Female is a sex identity. He thinks most respondents will know if they are Man, Woman, or Other. He added that the Interim Provost has approved the current version of the survey.

Senator Boynton observed that Question #10, “Overall, the Interim Provost fosters an academic environment that is rewarding for 1) faculty to work, and 2) students to learn” is being eliminated. She asked if the reason is because there is a similar question that appears elsewhere in the survey. Senator Hironimus-Wendt responded that CPPP thought this was similar to new Question #9, “Overall, the Interim Provost fosters the academic mission of Western Illinois University.” He added that CPPP is not opposed to adding or deleting questions upon the recommendation of the Senate. Senator Allison thinks the word “rewarding” in Question #10 is an important one. Senator Bellott suggested that perhaps the two questions can be merged so that Question #9 states that the Interim Provost “fosters the academic mission and a rewarding academic environment.” Senator Boynton thinks that both questions belong in the survey. Senator Hironimus-Wendt pointed out that Question #3 states that “The Interim Provost effectively promotes an environment for excellence in 1) scholarship, and 2) teaching and learning.” Senator Rahman remarked that, if she had to choose between the two questions, she prefers Question #10 that was to be cut, but she is okay with including both. Senator Boynton thinks it is good to separate out the faculty and the students, as is done in Question #10.

Senator Boynton observed that Question #18, “The Interim Provost works effectively with the President and Deans to allocate resources for your department or academic unit to achieve Western Illinois University’s mission,” is also being cut. She asked if that question is repeated elsewhere in the survey. Senator Hironimus-Wendt pointed out that Question #7 states, “The Interim Provost effectively promotes resource development for academic affairs”; Question #6 asks if “The Interim Provost manages the University’s resources well”; and Question #5 states, “The Interim Provost effectively promotes policies that foster the activities of your department or academic unit,” so there’s a lot of overlap. Senator Boynton stated that she is then fine with leaving Question #18 out.

Senator Boynton asked if Question #29, “The Interim Provost ensures that university policies, procedures, and available resources are transparent to 1) faculty, 2) staff, and 3) students,” was revised to new Question #14, “The Interim Provost ensures that university policies, procedures, and available resources are transparent to you.” Senator Hironimus-Wendt confirmed that is correct. Senator Boynton said this makes sense because faculty may not know what students consider to be transparent. Senator Hironimus-Wendt related that was part of the problem with both previous surveys: faculty did not think they could assess how the President and Interim Provost interacted with students.

Senator Czechowski observed that Question #9 states, “Overall, the Interim Provost fosters the academic mission of Western Illinois University.” She asked how respondents

are to find the academic mission. Senator Hironimus-Wendt responded that in the President's survey, CPPP added a response choice for "Do not know the mission." Senator Czechowski observed that the academic mission is not easy to find on the University website. She thinks if the survey is going to ask questions about the academic mission, it should be stated in the body of the survey. Senator Hironimus-Wendt suggested that there could be a hyperlink to it. Senator Czechowski remarked that the mission seems to change so often that she cannot keep up with it. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that it was last changed in 2015 and prior to that in 2011. Senator Roberts suggested that CPPP ask the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (CITR), who administers the survey, to have the definition pop up when respondents hover over the words "academic mission." Senator Boynton added that the academic mission can be found in the undergraduate catalog. Senator Allison stated that if the intention is to see how many faculty know the University's mission, that does not seem to be a question for the Provost survey unless CPPP thinks that if faculty do not know the mission that says something about the Interim Provost. Senator Hironimus-Wendt related that some members of CPPP did not know the academic mission, so an extra response choice of "Do not know the mission" was added to the President's survey on a similar question. He added that whatever way the academic mission question is worded, it will be done similarly with both the President and Provost surveys. Senator Czechowski said she would rather not spend a lot of time looking for the mission so would like to see the link included in some way.

Chairperson Rock asked if there are any objections to the survey if there is a link to the academic mission on Question #9 and if Question #10 is added back in.

NO OBJECTIONS

C. Ad Hoc Budget Transparency Committee (Susan Czechowski, Chair)

1. Report and Recommendation

Senator Czechowski told senators the ad hoc committee met a few times and thinks there is a need for a permanent Budget Transparency Committee to be established. She related the ad hoc committee members gathered a lot of information; when Vice President for Administrative Services and Interim Budget Director Matt Bierman came to Faculty Senate earlier this semester, a lot of the discussion was guided by questions developed by the ad hoc committee Budget Transparency Committee.

The ad hoc committee recommends that the permanent Budget Transparency Committee be composed of one member of the Senate Executive Committee plus one senator from each college who would serve two-year staggered terms. Senator Czechowski said the ad hoc committee would prefer to see a smaller committee that reports to the full Senate and can get work done, come up with questions, and find out the answers. Senator Boynton pointed out that under this proposal one college would potentially be represented twice. She observed that the Senate Nominating Committee has four members, one from each college, and it might be a burden for smaller colleges, such as the College of Fine Arts and Communication which will have two senators next year, to have to serve on both committees. Senator Allison agreed that Senator Boynton's concern makes sense; she related that the ad hoc committee was trying to assure that each college had representation. Senator Czechowski stated that bigger committees sometimes do not seem to get things done, and the ad hoc committee seemed very efficient, so they wanted to keep the new Budget Transparency Committee small as well.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt is in favor of the proposal and looks forward to the Senate Bylaws amendment to create the new committee. He asked if the membership needs to be composed of senators or if the ad hoc committee would consider faculty outside the

Senate. He raised the question because the proposal requires a member of the Executive Committee, and he thinks ExCo is already overburdened with meetings every other week, plus their members already serve on other committees. He also wonders if there should be a member of the administration serving in an ex-officio role. He observed that the proposal asks for the Budget Director to meet with the Budget Transparency Committee once each semester, but wonders if it might be good to have an ex-officio member from the Vice President for Administrative Services office. Interim Provost Neumann pointed out that Vice President for Administrative Services Matt Bierman is currently doing double-duty since he also serves as the Interim Budget director, but those are two separate offices. She added that the Budget Office reports to the President.

Chairperson Rock related that there was some discussion about whether the Budget Transparency Committee needed to be an internal Senate committee staffed by senators who volunteer to serve or whether it should be filled through the Senate Nominating Committee process by faculty outside of the Senate, but the ad hoc committee wanted it to be an internal committee. He suggested that if there is not sufficient Senate interest in future to staff the committee, the Senate could discuss adjusting the composition for it to include external faculty. Mathematics and Philosophy professor Christopher Pynes, who chaired Faculty Senate last year, explained it was suggested that the Budget Transparency Committee be internal because the prior two years there were many instances where Faculty Senate wanted the Budget Director to come to meetings to answer questions. He observed that a Budget Transparency Committee could get questions answered on the Senate's behalf and report back to senators, so it would be useful for it to be internal in terms of communicating with the administration. He pointed out that just because the College of Fine Arts and Communication has two dedicated Senate seats does not preclude them from winning an at-large seat as well. Dr. Pynes thinks it is important for the Committee to be internal because when Faculty Senate has questions about the budget it would provide for easier access to the administration, and that was the original idea behind the proposal.

Senator Rahman remarked that five members seems like a lot, and it may be a burden on one or more colleges, but she agrees with Dr. Pynes that the Committee should be comprised of senators. She would suggest, however, that the Budget Transparency Committee be comprised of four members, one from each college, and the person who is chosen from the Executive Committee be the representative from that college. Senator Allison said she does not care whether there are four or five members, but she thinks it is important that there be an Executive Committee member for purposes of communication. She also thinks it might be nice if there were another person serving from the ExCo member's department since that might help the ExCo member not to have to shoulder as much of the burden of the Committee's legwork.

Senator Roberts observed that under Tasked Assignments it states "Determine policies which will provide for faculty participation in the preparation of the budgets of the University." He asked if the ad hoc committee has the sense that the administration is open to faculty participating in the University's budgets. Senator Boynton pointed out that this statement comes directly from the Faculty Senate Constitution. Senator Roberts asked if the Budget Transparency Committee will be a fact-finding committee or a policy-making committee. Senator Czechowski responded that it would be a fact-finding committee. Senator Perabo added that it would be more like the Budget Transparency Committee members becoming experts on the budget so that if the Senate wanted to act on a particular policy, such as scholarship distribution, the Committee could look at the budget, have a good sense of what is going on with it, and make statements about it so that the Senate could make recommendations about budgetary policy.

Chairperson Rock said he gets the sense the body is supportive of creating a permanent Budget Transparency Committee. He asked if senators want the composition to remain as

recommended or to change it. Senator Czechowski responded that she is fine with the composition as proposed. She related that the ad hoc committee thought it was important for the permanent committee to be internal. She said the ad hoc committee did not want only the faculty union asking monetary questions of the administration but for faculty to truly have a voice around the table when talking to the administration. Senator Roberts pointed out the Committee should be composed of an odd number in case there needs to be a vote of its members.

NO OBJECTIONS TO THE REPORT

Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that since the body is in favor, there now needs to be a formal amendment to the Bylaws to come forward. Chairperson Rock will ask ExCo to put a Bylaws change on their next agenda.

IV. Old Business

A. CCPI Review of Comprehensive Majors and Academic Terms

Chairperson Rock recalled that there was insufficient time to complete discussion of this item at the previous Senate meeting, so consideration will be continued at this meeting. Dr. Pynes stated that a couple of different senators asked him to give some history of the review. He commended CCPI on the amount of work they have put into the review process, but he would recommend sending the review report back to CCPI for changes. Dr. Pynes observed that it is good CCPI included a sundown clause for curricular revisions. He believes that if there are to be new changes, all programs need to be held to the same standard in order not to disadvantage existing programs. Dr. Pynes related that Interim Provost Neumann came to the Executive Committee last year to ask CCPI to look into a number of concerns, one of which was siloing, where a bunch of students are siloed into one program in a curricular manner. Dr. Pynes recalled that until this time ExCo had not noticed this occurring. Interim Provost Neumann also wanted CCPI to look at academic terms and comprehensive majors.

Dr. Pynes thinks CCPI's recommendations are mostly good, but two are problematic, one of which is identifying a core course or courses in a minor. He would suggest removing CCPI's suggestion that a minor "Must include core course(s), may include optional courses, and should include upper-division hours." He foresees that problems may occur in small programs with few faculty. Dr. Pynes explained that with the elimination of some majors, there are some small minors, and if a core course is identified, that privileges a particular course. He noted that upper-level courses may only be taught by one of three or four faculty members, which puts an additional burden on them. He noted that upper-level core courses may not be taught as often, which disadvantages students, but if the core course is lower-level it may influence how other courses are taught. He added that to have the core course be a Gen Ed course may also seem strange. Dr. Pynes thinks it makes sense to have core courses in majors but not in minors.

Dr. Pynes told senators that last year's Executive Committee also noticed that students were being encouraged and allowed to major and minor in the same discipline. He said this is an oddity because WIU did not allow this for a long time. He related that when Philosophy was a major, the department also offered an Ethics minor, but they would not have allowed a student to do both. Dr. Pynes stated that Interim Provost Neumann was concerned about academic breadth, which is the point of a minor. He said that comprehensive majors are different, and if departments think that a program has sufficient academic depth they can submit it as a comprehensive major to curricular review bodies rather than cobbling one together with a major and minor in the same discipline. Dr. Pynes related that he, Senator McIlvaine-Newsad, and History Chair Jennifer McNabb, who comprised the Executive Committee at the time, each looked at ten peer institutions (30 institutions total), and almost all prohibited majoring and minoring in the same discipline.

Dr. Pynes noted that p. 6 of the CCPI report states, “The opinion of CCPI was that while majors and minors could be offered within the same discipline, students should not be able to complete a major and a minor in the same discipline.” Dr. Pynes stated that this gets to the sense of what last year’s ExCo wanted CCPI to do, but he does not approve of the language because it makes it seem like students could not take a major and minor in the same discipline at all. Last year’s ExCo submitted language to CCPI suggesting that WIU adopt a system of primary and secondary minors. He explained that if a student wanted to minor in a program within the same discipline as his or her major, the student would have to take a different, primary minor first. He said this system would not altogether prevent students from majoring and minoring in the same discipline, but the minor could not be primary. Dr. Pynes believes that if students think those courses are important and they want to spend the time and money, they should be able to minor within their disciplines, but it should not be at the cost of academic breadth, and siloing should not be encouraged. He added that after looking at 30 other universities, he believes that sundowning and not allowing majors and minors in the same discipline are correct, but the wordsmithing needs to be right, and having cores in minors does not make sense. Dr. Pynes said there was a lot of discussion last year about CCPI’s review, but this summarizes the good and the bad of their recommendations. He stressed that if a department thinks their students need to major and minor within the same discipline, they should go through the process to make the major comprehensive rather than a cobbled together comprehensive major.

Chairperson Rock asked what is being defined as a discipline since that seems to be a key concept. Dr. Pynes responded that decisions will have to be made regarding this definition. He pointed out that CCPI has developed a list of what constitutes a discipline but, like defining porn, it is “hard to define but you know it when you see it.” He stated that most things in a department are similarly disciplinary; that does not mean that they are all the same discipline, and some decisions have to be made regarding this term. Dr. Pynes related that one university requires the dean to give permission if a student wants to major and minor in the same discipline. He believes that Faculty Senate will have to make decisions about what constitutes a discipline in the Schools of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration or Computer Sciences, for example. Dr. Pynes told senators that 15 of the 17 Network Technologies minors last year were Computer Science majors. He believes that if a department has a minor but no one outside of the department is taking it, that is an indication of siloing, which was of concern to the Interim Provost.

School of Computer Sciences Director Dennis DeVolder stated that some of the distinction between whether fields of study are in the same discipline is already well defined within the prospective disciplines. He noted that when those outside of the School of Computer Sciences look at their majors – Computer Science, Cyber Security, Information Systems, and Network Technologies, which is being sundowned – many may not see their distinctions. He asserts, however, that a Computer Science major and an Information Systems minor are no more siloed than a Sociology major and an Anthropology minor because they are different disciplines. Dr. DeVolder fears what will happen if somebody outside the School has to define Computer Science’s disciplines. Senator Sandage asked if Dr. DeVolder is concerned that someone who is a Computer Science major would not be allowed to minor in Information Systems and whether he thinks students should be allowed to do that. Dr. DeVolder responded that students should be allowed if that is what they want to do and if it is within the rules of the program as approved. He said that while it is fine to argue about this point at CCPI and Faculty Senate as curriculum goes through the approval process, the School of Computer Sciences is very conscientious about what they do. He pointed out that a Cyber Security major, for example, is not allowed to take *any* minor offered by the School of Computer Sciences, and that is by design; an Information Systems major must take a Business minor, and that also is by design. Dr. DeVolder added that, although there is a Cyber Security emphasis available to Computer Science majors, a Computer Science major who wanted to take a Cyber Security minor can do so; Computer Sciences requested for that to be approved, which again is by design. He stressed that the School of Computer Sciences is not making mistakes, from their perspective.

Chairperson Rock suggested that the discussion focus on whether the minor should have a core. CCPI Chair Anita Hardeman related that, in reviewing the idea of a core, CCPI felt that if the minor represented some kind of concentrated body of knowledge, albeit at less depth, there should be some core of component knowledge that can be identified. CCPI asked Linda Prosis from the Provost's office to provide information on current minors, and there were only 12 that do not already have a core. She pointed out that this means the practice has already been to designate some group of one or more required courses which, in effect, become a core, or to explicitly state that certain courses within a minor are a core, so CCPI felt that they were just solidifying a practice which already exists. Dr. Hardeman stated that if a program felt very strongly that there was not a single course that they could identify as a core, departmental representatives would have the opportunity to come before CCPI and explain why there should be an exception to the rule.

Senator Boynton asked if a core in a minor is the same as saying that there is one required course that everyone enrolling in a minor would have to take. She pointed out that majors often have options, and a core for a major must be the same for all of its options, but various minors do not typically have to all have the same core, so the language seems confusing. Dr. Hardeman replied that each minor would have its own core. Senator Boynton asked why the wording could not be changed to "required courses" rather than "core" since "core" means something different for the major than it would for the minor. Dr. Hardeman responded that from CCPI's perspective it would mean the same thing: a core is a set of required courses for which there are no options or substitutions. She said that CCPI would like to be consistent, so they either need to be called "required courses" in the major, which already has a separate "Other" category of required courses, or they should be called "core" in both the major and the minor. Senator Boynton stated that it does not seem consistent to her because a core has meaning for the major because there are multiple options. She is also not sure there needs to be one course that everyone enrolling in a minor must take as opposed to having them choose one of two or three courses.

Senator Allison agreed that she is not sure a minor needs to have certain required courses. She added that it seems that Dr. Hardeman is saying that if a department felt strongly in another direction, CCPI might allow for an exception, but in her experience of going before CCPI it is extremely rare for that body to grant an exception, and she is not comfortable with that. Senator Hironimus-Wendt is in favor of retaining the current language for minors. He pointed out that the first bullet point currently states that minors should include specific course requirements, and the second bullet point says they may include specified courses from more than one academic department, which allows departments flexibility in creating their own minors. He is not in favor of including that minors must include core course(s) and prefers the current language as is.

Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration (RPTA) professor Jeremy Robinett related that an example of a core within a minor is his department's interdisciplinary Event Planning minor. He told senators it has a core Hospitality Management class during which students work toward certification and which is required for other classes in the program. He stated that the core knowledge gained in this class benefits students throughout all the other classes they have to take, and when that certification is referenced later, it is helpful if it is already completed. He said this might be one example of why minors have classes that are required, or core, because it becomes helpful for students to take these courses as they enter the minor so that they understand what is being discussed in their future classes. Senator Boynton said she is not opposed to having minors set up with core required classes, but she does not think that all minors need to be set up that way. Senator Plos stated that Kinesiology has a Coaching minor that requires an Anatomy and Physiology core course because everything in coaching, from how to tape an ankle to how to teach someone to do a skill, is based on anatomy and physiology.

Senator Allison stated that she is not arguing that minors not be allowed to have a core. She pointed out that the English minor has a core; there is a reason that English has a core in its minor, and she is not arguing that it should be taken away. Senator Allison stated, however, that she can think of reasons why it would not be necessary to have required classes in a minor, so she is not arguing against having required classes but against the ability not to have them. Senator Boynton

stated students must take three of the four survey classes for their general History minor, but if they are really interested in modern history they will probably not take the ancient history survey class. She believes that having the choice of which classes to take allows students to shape the minor to meet their needs, depending on their interests.

SGA senator Elizabeth Swann observed that some courses in minors have prerequisites and wonders what the difference would be between having to take a prerequisite course and taking a core course in a minor. Interim Provost Neumann responded that the guidelines being considered are for use by departments that are developing curriculum in order to make sure that what is put in the undergraduate catalog is clear for everybody, but it is not the operational side of courses, which is what students see when moving through the curriculum. She added that the intention is to make sure that every unit that comes forward with a proposal understands the parameters before they propose their curriculum to CCPI.

Senator Perabo said she is in favor of the current language for minors rather than the revised language. She can envision a number of occasions where students may want to choose between classes for the minor, and restricting students to take one or another required core courses in a minor might be problematic. Senator Rahman understands why certain courses might be required to comprise a core for a major with multiple options, but she does not like the idea of treating a minor like a major. She believes minors are places where students should be allowed more freedom, and each minor wants to be able to offer that, so she prefers the older, current language. Senator Allison expressed her concern with the language requiring minors to include upper-division hours. She can imagine redesigning a minor to include only introductory courses and no upper division, so she would prefer “may include” rather than “should include upper-division hours.”

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if Faculty Senate has the ability to amend the report on the floor. Parliamentarian Kaul responded that there was a motion at the last meeting to approve the report as submitted, but a friendly amendment would be allowable.

Motion: To strike the new language under Minor “Proposed” and retain the current Minor language (Hironimus-Wendt/Westerhold)

Dr. Hardeman pointed out that the language was discussed extensively in CCPI meetings, and the report has been taken back to the Council before, but she will take it back again if necessary. She admitted that she can see there are some different opinions, so Faculty Senate may have to decide what they want to do with the report.

MOTION APPROVED 14 YES – 1 NO – 5 AB

Regarding majors and minors in the same discipline, Chairperson Rock observed that CCPI’s language seems to be consistent with what Dr. Pynes was talking about – that majors and minors can be offered within the same discipline but students should not be able to complete a major and minor in the same discipline. Dr. Pynes remarked that CCPI’s language is actually stronger than what last year’s Executive Committee suggested: at the top of p. 6 the CCPI report states, “The opinion of CCPI was that while majors and minors could be offered within the same discipline, students should not be able to complete a major and a minor in the same discipline.” Dr. Pynes recalled that ExCo suggested one way to deal with the Interim Provost’s concerns about siloing was for students to be able to take a minor in their discipline that was not their primary minor. He explained this is not a prohibition but an attempt to create academic breadth; it is not an attempt to tell Computer Science students they cannot minor in Network Technology but to say it could not be their primary minor. Dr. Pynes told senators that 77 percent of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration (LEJA) minors are also majoring within LEJA, which illustrates the Interim Provost’s concern.

Wil Gradle, Board of Trustees member and graduate student, expressed disagreement with some of Dr. Pynes's points from the standpoint of the disparity between what faculty think minors are used for and what students think minors are used for. He explained that one way students see minors is to provide breadth and diversity; an example might be an LEJA major that thinks adding a Spanish minor might help him or her to get hired. Mr. Gradle stated the other piece is specialization, opportunities to hone their majors to be more in line with their interests, and he thinks this is one thing that gives WIU's programs strength. Mr. Gradle related that when he came to WIU, what attracted him was that he could major in LEJA and minor in Homeland Security because that would make him a better candidate on the job market or to pursue graduate studies in that field. He thinks that students see minors in a different light than faculty and the administration; to students, the opportunity to minor in a different but related field to their major makes them stronger, not weaker. Mr. Gradle believes that educational breadth is more relevant to General Education and that students would see it as a prohibition if they were not allowed to take the minor they want to take until they took a different minor first. He noted that students are increasingly not graduating in four years but are staying longer than they expected, and when the University puts more requirements on a student, whether it be Gen Ed or additional minors, that costs money and time. He believes that WIU should want to give students more choices rather than fewer and to empower departments to decide what intentional pieces should be added to assure that their students get breadth as well as the freedom to be autonomous adults who can decide what they want to study.

LEJA Director Jill Myers expressed her agreement with Mr. Gradle that minors should be a matter of student choice. She pointed out that WIU is a regional institution with a lot of students majoring in law enforcement, but this semester law enforcement students are double majoring in 20 different departments and are taking 52 different minors on campus, so they are getting a breadth of information from all kinds of programs. She related that 130 LEJA students are minoring in Psychology; Sociology has 95 LEJA majors minoring in it this semester; Spanish has 81 LEJA students who are taking it as a minor; and there are other LEJA majors who are taking minors in Computer Sciences, Forensic Psychology, Communication, and Chemistry. LEJA majors are double majoring in such disciplines as Foreign Languages, Psychology, and Sociology. She asserted that LEJA students are not siloing themselves but are taking a very broad view of their educations. Dr. Myers believes it is true of LEJA and equally true of Computer Sciences that they encompass very broad topics; LEJA ranges from public individuals to the police, the courts, and the correction side. She pointed out that most students are coming to WIU to get a job, and students know that in order to get a job in the criminal justice area they should have something on their transcripts that shows a Homeland Security, Computer Sciences, or Spanish minor. Dr. Myers heard from agencies just this week indicating they are looking for Criminal Justice majors with certain criteria, including Computer Science, Homeland Security, Foreign Language, and Criminalistics minors, and when these types of things show up on a students' transcripts, they are getting jobs. She believes that to remove that choice from students, who know exactly what job they want to get when they graduate from WIU, would be a mistake, particularly when the discipline of law enforcement is so big.

Dr. Myers stated that the fear that one faculty member would teach all of a student's classes if they were to major and minor in the same department is absolutely not true. She said that this is impossible in the School of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration because faculty specialize in their own areas of LEJA; students have to take classes in the seven different areas of their major, so they will get seven different professors. She added that LEJA relies heavily on adjuncts, and students will usually take classes from another five or six of these instructors as well, so there is no way that they could complete their major by taking classes from only one or two professors. Dr. Myers asserted that LEJA recruits probably more than any other department on campus; their faculty go out to talk to students three to five days a week. She told senators they talk to students about all of the University's programs because LEJA students are interested in double minoring and double majoring in other areas. Dr. Myers related that of the 940 LEJA students who are taking minors, 312 are taking minors within the School and 628 are minoring outside of LEJA; 169 LEJA students are double minoring, and ten are triple minoring, so LEJA is not siloing its minors. Dr. Myers stressed that LEJA recruiters listen to what students want and spend a lot of time talking to

them about why they want to minor in certain areas; she said students want to get a job after graduation, and LEJA helps them to pick a minor they would enjoy that will help them get the job they want. She explained that if students want to go into the public relations of criminal justice, work on a crime scene, delve into the sociology of criminals, help victims, or write policy, LEJA will help students choose minors in Philosophy, History, Prelaw, or other areas. She thinks that students should dictate what minors they want rather than WIU dictating to students what minors they can take because WIU students are bright and are not siloing themselves.

Dr. Myers pointed out that when discussions center on academic breadth, it is important to realize that LEJA does not offer a single General Education or Global Issues class in their school, and every minor offered within LEJA includes both required and elective classes outside the specific program so that their students do not get “tunnel vision.” Dr. Myers added that it would be hard to find a more diverse group than LEJA faculty. She stressed that LEJA students are getting both breadth and depth within their programs and from their professors, plus 49 LEJA students are double majoring in 20 different departments outside of LEJA.

Chairperson Rock asked if any changes are being proposed to section 3 of the CCPI report on p. 5, An Examination of Majors and Minors within the Same Discipline. Dr. Hardeman responded that this was not something that is on the Terms Related to Academic Programming chart and was only included in the report. Interim Provost Neumann remarked that she thought Faculty Senate was debating the grid because the grid is the operational version of the report. Dr. Hardeman clarified that where CCPI recommended changes to the grid, these have been discussed in the report. She stated that in the original Terms Related to Academic Programming grid there was no discussion of overlap because, while this is discussed at CCPI, overlap is handled by the Registrar’s office, so while it is a condition of academic programming, it is not really the same kind of thing that CCPI is defining. She added that this is a definition level that CCPI did not consider. Senator Boynton agreed that the definition of a non-comprehensive major states that it “Requires completion of a minor as part of the degree program,” but does not state that the minor must be outside the discipline.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt told senators that he has been at at-large senator for nine years and not a representative of any college, so he tries to think what is in the best interests of the students. While he appreciates Mr. Gradle’s and Dr. Myers’s perspectives regarding students being consumers and choosing what they want to enroll in, he is opposed to that concept. He stated that while there are discussions about students becoming specialists in an area, there are many ways to accomplish that through options, tracks, or concentrations without allocating the minor to accomplish that task. He stated that while he is glad that LEJA students have minors in Sociology and other disciplines, it is concerning that one-third of them are minoring in LEJA programs. Senator Hironimus-Wendt said his concern was not whether students would take all 60 hours from one professor but from one group of faculty, as a plural concept. He pointed out that a non-comprehensive major is typically 45-48 hours; a comprehensive major adds another 18 hours, with 15 additional hours taken from within the major, so a minor could not be added on top of that. He stated that while the University wants students to shop around and get a breadth of knowledge, which is what the state mandates, the state does not say that universities should serve the sole interests of the students and let them “drive the show.” He believes what is required is that the University prepare a general education that every citizen of the state of Illinois should be exposed to so that they can become liberal arts educated people who are engaged and informed citizens of the state, and this is the role of the Gen Ed curriculum. Senator Hironimus-Wendt explained that if a handful of professors in a discipline deliver 45 hours plus an additional 15 hours (comprehensive major), or deliver a major and a minor (non-comprehensive major), then about 60 hours – half a student’s education – is being delivered by a small group of faculty in a discipline within a program, which he finds concerning. Senator Hironimus-Wendt likes the idea of breadth and would like to see WIU get to the point someday where both comprehensive and non-comprehensive majors have free electives instead of specifying the elective courses that students must take. He thinks that the administration has focused so intently on not imposing on the wishes of students and the wishes of departments that

the University has divorced itself from what it is trying to do as a collective and has siloed departments itself rather than students siloing themselves.

Parliamentarian Kaul asserted that it is a mischaracterization to indicate that a student can major and minor in the same discipline because that is already prohibited. He pointed out that Computer Science majors cannot minor in Computer Science, Economics majors cannot minor in Economics, and Mathematics majors cannot minor in Math. He stated that Philosophy chose to not let its students minor in Ethics, but that is a choice that they made, whereas History majors cannot minor in History and Political Science majors cannot minor in Political Science. He thinks it is a mischaracterization of what constitutes a major and a minor to say that one can major and minor in the same discipline. Parliamentarian Kaul also pointed out that what Senator Hironimus-Wendt forgot to indicate was that students are supposed to complete 60 hours of General Education in the College of Arts and Sciences and 43 hours of Gen Ed for degrees in the other three colleges. He stated that these hours are mandated by the state, but what Senator Hironimus-Wendt seems to be asking is that hours be added to General Education and reduced from other hours within the major, and that is really what is under discussion. He thinks Faculty Senate seems to be looking for extra terms that would basically define disciplinary aspects as part of the departmental aspects of programs, and that is what is causing confusion; the body needs instead to talk about what it really wants to distinguish between a minor and a major regardless of whether a department is siloing or not. Parliamentarian Kaul understands that those who teach in General Education would like to have an additional share of the pie, but that should be stated accordingly rather than saying that WIU is not meeting the state's mandate when half of every degree in Arts and Sciences and one-third of every degree in the other colleges is General Education, and that needs to be fully understood.

RPTA Chair Dan Yoder said his department has five different minors (RPTA, Event Planning and Management, Outdoor Leadership, Non-Profit Administration, and Therapeutic Recreation). He believes that, on a general level, limiting student choice today is a bad idea. He does not think student choice is a fad that will go away in a couple of years but is the future of higher education. Dr. Yoder stated that while he is not arguing for students "driving the ship" or being in charge, students want choices, and he thinks that if WIU limits student choice it will be taking a step back. He believes it is important for RPTA students to be able to transcript a minor that employers are looking for, and employers are not looking for minors in Sociology, Mathematics, or Psychology but in Outdoor Leadership, Therapeutic Recreation, or Event Planning and Management. Dr. Yoder thinks the idea of a primary and secondary minor almost seems as if some people are saying that if students need to take a few more classes or take more time to graduate, that is not a big issue, but everyone knows that is a big issue for students. Dr. Yoder stressed that students cannot and will not pay for more classes, and if the University adopts this approach it will lose students.

Dr. DeVolder remarked that Computer Sciences continues to be used as an example, and the idea that students who major in one of the school's offerings and minor in another will have classes taught by the same faculty is false. He stated that while they are not broken out in the undergraduate catalog, the class schedule shows that faculty who teach Computer Science classes do not teach Information Systems classes and vice versa, with only one (online) exception. He stressed that the student who majors in Computer Science and minors in Information Systems is being taught by two separate groups of faculty that do not overlap. He asserted that the same is true, for the most part, for those who teach Computer Science and Cyber Security classes; while there is a possibility that perhaps two of the classes in the Cyber Security minor might be taught by someone who teaches in the Computer Science major, the school has over 20 faculty members, and students will take classes from more faculty members than some students even see in other majors. Dr. DeVolder told senators that if they want to talk about overlap, they should also examine minors with cross-listed courses because they might look like they are different areas but they are taught by the same people. Dr. DeVolder pointed out that students vote with their wallets; they come to WIU with an objective that they want to achieve, and if that objective is to major in Computer Science and minor in Information Systems, but they are told they cannot do so because Faculty Senate thinks those are the same discipline, or they are told they must take a different

minor first, students will simply go somewhere else. Dr. DeVolder pointed out that there are four levels of checks and balances before curriculum goes into the catalog – department, college, CCPI, and Faculty Senate – and he believes that if that is not enough, nothing will be enough. He added that if secondary minors are not enough, then there will need to be tertiary minors and beyond. He thinks Faculty Senate should trust its committees and councils to do their work and do it well, and if they submit something to the Senate that senators do not think has been done sufficiently well, it should be sent back to the council, but the Senate should not throw the work out.

Engineering Technology professor Denise Gravitt, who serves on CCPI, told senators that it is the Council's job to evaluate curricular issues, but CCPI does not have control of overlap regarding who is teaching which classes. Dr. Gravitt's area is served by a little over two faculty members, and she has to teach nine of the classes within her major, but she cannot do anything about that because there are limited numbers of faculty. She pointed out that this has nothing to do with the academic terms for minors and majors, how they are proposed and evaluated, and their appropriate breakdown, which is what the Senate should be evaluating in the CCPI report. Dr. Gravitt explained that CCPI evaluates what is brought to them by departments, and the Council has to trust that departmental faculty have the best interests of the students at heart. She stated that CCPI did not want to impose higher standards of depth and breadth on non-comprehensive majors than are imposed on comprehensive majors. She pointed out that comprehensive majors often have to respond to outside forces, such as accreditation, advisory boards, and industry requirements, and if they meet depth and breadth in their requirements, it is not within CCPI's purview to say they do not know what they are talking about, nor should non-comprehensive majors be held to different standards. She believes that everyone needs to trust that the curriculum being presented is the best balance for students that are buying these services to meet what industries want from WIU graduates. She stressed that CCPI has nothing to do with staffing issues, and she thinks the focus should be put back on the report.

SGA representative Madison Lynn expressed agreement with Senator Rahman's earlier statement regarding a core in a minor because a minor is not a major, and there should be more freedom allowed in a minor than in a major. She thinks this is especially important in regards to student choice, particularly in light of current enrollment issues. She expressed agreement with Drs. DeVolder and Yoder that students vote with their wallets, do not want to stay at a university longer than they have to, and would not want to be forced to complete a double minor. Ms. Lynn said she feels comfortable asserting that WIU students are generally not afraid to go somewhere else, which is something that should be kept in mind in the current discussions. Ms. Lynn is a freshman and told senators that when she began considering where to go to college, academic programs and degree plans were number one on her list, and she thinks this is true of most students. She understands that WIU is not an institution run by students, but she does not think that their values should be taken lightly, particularly with the current enrollment situation, and she believes that issues of restricting academic freedom are important to students.

Admissions Director Seth Minor stated that, speaking from the enrollment side, he agrees that students will vote with their wallets. He related that recruiters at college fairs and high school visits have students' attention for a limited time, and academic programs is a huge factor in the decision making process for prospective students. He said students often tell him they have an interest in more than one program; students are thinking ahead as to how this will look on their resumes, and minors can raise students to the top of employers' notice, which is huge. Mr. Miner told senators that if Admissions representatives have to explain to potential students during the recruitment process that, unfortunately, they cannot choose the minor they want, or that they must take a primary minor before they can take the minor they really want, those students will be gone. He stressed that students are mainly looking for good academic programs and universities that can meet those needs. He believes that, during the recruitment process, students do steer the ship, and it has a lot to do with what they can get academically from an institution.

SGA President Grant Reed told senators that his first time at Faculty Senate has turned out to be a very exciting meeting. He said that as a double major in Agricultural Science and Political Science

– two disciplines that, while they do coincide in certain aspects, are very far apart from one another – he values the idea of making sure that students have depth and breadth in their educations and experience different things. He believes, however, that student choice is also important and should not be discounted at this institution. Mr. Reed thinks it is unfair to hold students as the movable body to solve departmental or staffing problems because students do not have a stake in those issues. He said that students are voting with their wallets and with the decisions about what classes they choose to take. He asserted that academic advisors are not telling students they must minor in certain areas because advisors have no stake in this decision; even though advisors may work in a certain department, they report to the unit which oversees academic advising. Mr. Reed stressed that if WIU wants to remain a friendly, marketable, approachable institution for students, it should not limit students' choices when they come to Western or students will go somewhere else. The SGA President told senators he has spoken to a lot of students who told him that if they had a limitation on what minors they could select, they would go to a university that offered that academic freedom, even though it might cost more. Mr. Reed stressed that if the decision is made to add time and money onto students' degrees so that they can take the minors that they want, they will go somewhere else where they can take what they want immediately. Mr. Reed believes that if WIU wants to keep retention and recruitment at the forefront of the argument, which everyone should be doing in the state of Illinois, he strongly urges Faculty Senate to keep majors and minors as they are currently and to retain student choice.

Dr. Hardeman stated that students have raised interesting points. She pointed out a correction to Senator Hironimus-Wendt's statement that comprehensive majors require 15 additional hours to be taken within the major discipline; those 15 hours need to be from *outside the discipline* with the idea that these add part of the breadth. Dr. Hardeman believes that the issue really facing Faculty Senate is the definition of a discipline, and whether the Senate prefers a broad definition or a narrow one. She explained the broad definition defines disciplines by departments or schools, and in that case the definition of discipline that is being suggested is one which the University imposes on various areas that have been composed administratively into units and tells them that they must be comprised of a cohesive discipline. CCPI, on the other hand, would advocate for a narrow definition of discipline that arrives organically from within the academic areas and that the areas themselves represent what is true and authentic about their courses of study. Dr. Hardeman pointed out that Parliamentarian Kaul spoke to this point when he pointed out that students already cannot major and minor in specific areas by the intent of those areas because departments know where the disciplinary overlap occurs. Dr. Hardeman thinks it would be a dangerous step for the Senate to impose a definition of discipline that is organized along departmental lines and in terms of primary and secondary minors. She stated that if the Senate declares that Computer Science majors should not minor in any area of that School, then Faculty Senate is imposing a definition of discipline based upon senators' conception of what that unit is, and she believes strongly that departments and schools should be able to speak for themselves. She added that this is why the CCPI report does not define a discipline but instead identifies ways that departments and schools can identify disciplines themselves.

Renee Polubinsky told senators that she is the Interim Chair of Kinesiology, oversees the Athletic Training program, and is an academic advisor. She said she is hearing a lot of credit being given to the disciplines, their faculty, and the chairs who are bringing students into their programs, but academic advisors are often the face of the University for students. She feels strongly about the choices that students are provided by WIU and believes that their choices need to be broad. She related that when academic advisors listen to students and what their interests are, they will often find that students will switch minors. Dr. Polubinsky thinks advisors are the ones that help students make those decisions and that the University should continue to allow that diversity to exist.

Senator Boynton agrees that with schools and departments consolidated into sometimes odd groupings, such as Mathematics and Philosophy, no one should say that a student cannot major and minor within the same unit. She realizes that for individuals outside the department, it may be hard to see the differences between, for example, Computer Science and Information Systems, but

that is why there are chairs. Senator Boynton stated that Gen Ed is the breadth of a program, the major provides the depth, and the minor is the squishy part in the middle. She stated that for some students minors provide additional breadth, for some they provide additional depth, and Senator Boynton tends to err on the side of flexibility. She also pointed out that this issue does not appear anywhere on the Terms of Academic Programs grid.

Senator Allison takes exception to the idea that the Senate at large is about increasing hours, making students stay longer at the University, and taking away student choice. She said that while she is hearing this echoed repeatedly, she does not see this in the CCPI report. She also does not see any evidence that departments are trying to solve enrollment issues through this report, and she takes exception to that as well. Chairperson Rock asked Senator Allison if she has any other issues she wanted to bring up about the report. Senator Allison responded that she does have other issues, but she is not sure there is time to raise them because it seems there is an effort to wrap up the discussion. Senator Boynton asked if there is any reason the discussion could not be continued in the spring since any recommendations from the report would not go into effect until Fall 2018 anyway.

Senator Bellott asked to raise the issue that was discussed at the last meeting about the change proposed for the definition of a comprehensive minor, from “Does not require completion of a Minor as part of the degree program” to “Cannot require completion of a Minor as part of the degree program.” He pointed out that if a comprehensive major included enough hours to complete a minor as part of the major, that comprehensive major, under the proposed wording, could not be approved. He does not like to see concrete wording that cannot be changed in the future. Dr. Hardeman replied that if that was the case, she could see no reason why the department would be proposing a comprehensive major rather than a non-comprehensive major. She explained the purpose of the comprehensive major is that it is specifically restrictive to programs where the concentration of non-major courses does not correspond to an existing minor. She said that if a comprehensive major that included a group of courses corresponding to an existing minor came before CCPI, the Council would send it back to the department with a recommendation that it be proposed as a non-comprehensive major rather than as comprehensive. She added that the point of the comprehensive major when that term was created was to identify programs where the “squishy part in the middle,” as Senator Boynton called it, did not match up to an existing minor. She said that if a department said that they wanted a comprehensive major but they also have an existing minor that they want their students to complete, they may as well create a non-comprehensive major. Senator Bellott asked what would happen if a student fortuitously got all of the classes that they would need for a minor as part of that comprehensive major; Dr. Hardeman responded that in this case the program should be designated as non-comprehensive. Senator Boynton pointed out that students can still take a minor when enrolled in a comprehensive major; they just cannot be forced to take one. Dr. Hardeman agreed that many students taking comprehensive majors do voluntarily complete a minor as well. Senator Bellott asked what would happen if there was a major in “Widgets” but as part of that major students would complete a Hospitality minor because some of the classes for the major fall into the Hospitality category; the Hospitality minor would not be required of the “Widgets” major, but there are enough Hospitality classes to complete that minor as part of the comprehensive major. He pointed out that with the proposed language, that could never happen. Dr. Hardeman replied that if the “Widgets” major contains all of the classes needed for a Hospitality minor, then “Widgets” should not be a comprehensive major. Senator Bellott asked what would happen if the courses were part of a required certification.

Associate Provost Parsons, who was on the original committee that created the definitions of academic terms, explained that students can get a minor with a comprehensive major, but with a comprehensive major a department cannot tell students that they must have a minor. Senator Bellott asked what would happen if the courses contained in the comprehensive major turn out to comprise a minor just by accident. Dr. Hardeman and Associate Provost Parsons responded that in this case there would be no reason for the major to be comprehensive, and it would not be approved as comprehensive. Senator Bellott stated that he is not comfortable voting to approve the

report. He added that someone needs to explain to him what a comprehensive major is and how this could not happen.

Motion: To table (Allison/Czechowski)

NO OBJECTIONS TO MOTION TO TABLE

V. New Business

A. Election of Senator to Serve on Provost's Advisory Council

Senator Bellott volunteered for the position to replace Senator Delany-Barmann on the Council during her Spring 2018 sabbatical and was elected by acclamation.

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

Susan Czechowski, Faculty Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary