

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Rescheduled Meeting, 14 February 2019, 4:00 p.m.
Union Capitol Rooms/WIUQC Riverfront 111

ACTION MINUTES

SENATORS PRESENT: M. Allison, B. Bellott, V. Boynton, S. Czechowski, R. Dimitrov, J. Franken, A. Hyde (via teleconference), S. Macchi, M. Maskarinec, H. McIlvaine-Newsad, B. Perabo, C. Pynes, S. Rahman, C. Tarrant, F. Tasdan, K. Zbeeb (via teleconference)

Ex-officio: Billy Clow, Interim Provost; Ilon Lauer, Parliamentarian

SENATORS ABSENT: S. Cordes, G. Delany-Barmann, J. Plos

GUESTS:

Macomb Campus: Victoria Baramidze, Angela Bonifas, Katrina Daytner, Tara Feld, Rich Filipink, Denise Gravitt, Jonathan Hammersley, Anita Hardeman, Keith Holz, Buzz Hoon, Bill Knox, Jim LaPrad, Angela Lynn, Colton Markey, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Rose McConnell, Jim McQuillan, Nathan Miczo, Russ Morgan, Kat Myers, Rafael Obregon, Lorette Oden, Gordon Pettit, Bill Polley, Eric Sheffield, Letitia Trepac, Scott Walker, Ron Williams

Quad Cities Campus via teleconference: Audrey Adamson, Ryan Colclasure, Thomas Finley, Everett Hamner, Helena Lira, Blair McDonald, Don McLean, Kristi Mindrup, Carla Paciotto, Brian Peer, Brenda Porter, Rob Porter, Bill Pratt, Trustee Yvonne Savala, Il-Seop Shin, Susan Stewart, Steve Whan, Brendan Young

Via Zoom: Joe Rives

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. January 22, 2019

Correction:

- On page 13, in the last paragraph, it states that “Parliamentarian Lauer remarked that Better World Books, a private company run by the University of Notre Dame, used to put big textbook donation boxes on campus and would then resell the books for profit.” This should indicate that the company is run by **graduates of** the University of Notre Dame.

MINUTES APPROVED AS CORRECTED

Senator Rahman asked about the change to WIU’s Carnegie classification referenced in the Executive Committee minutes. Chairperson Pynes told senators he received a very nice response to his email to Victor Borden, Project Director for the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education; Dr. Borden explained that the change stems from how many degrees WIU awards in particular areas. Chairperson Pynes confirmed that WIU’s administration did not ask for this change; Carnegie uses federal data to determine the classifications. He added that WIU went over the 60 percent line, which flipped the University from “Balanced arts and sciences/professions” to “Professions plus arts and sciences.”

II. Announcements

A. Provost's Report

Interim Provost Clow reported that the administration is looking into what it would take to fix the Capitol Rooms teleconferencing system because it needs to be addressed. He added that a lot of groups use the Capitol Rooms, and the system has become an embarrassment.

Interim Provost Clow announced that the Academic Program Elimination Review (APER) Committee report is due on Monday, February 18. He has scheduled a meeting with the Committee and will get the report distributed as soon as possible.

Senator Allison asked why everyone at WIU received the notice of an opening for a College Student Personnel (CSP) faculty member. Interim Provost Clow responded that he does not know and has not gone to Human Resources to find out. Senator Allison related that it raised an alarm for her and many other faculty as to whether the job opening notice meant that she was on a layoff list. She related that her husband, who is on the layoff list announced last summer, regularly receives position announcements, and some faculty read the email as an indication that they should be considering looking for a position elsewhere in the University. Senator Allison asked if there is a layoff list that exists currently; Interim Provost Clow responded that he does not have a list and has not seen a list. He added that he is waiting to see the results of the APER Committee report.

Senator Rahman asked about the status of the Director of Admissions search. Interim Provost Clow responded that candidates are being screened, and there was an initial phone interview, but he does not know if any follow-up has occurred yet. Chairperson Pynes reminded senators that undergraduate admissions falls under the Vice President for Student Services area.

Senator Boynton was struck by the fact that the search for a CSP faculty member is an internal search for a tenure track Unit A position. She wonders when WIU stopped conducting national searches for tenure track positions. Interim Provost Clow responded that there was a last second hire shortly before fall semester began to replace someone who had left the University, and now an internal search is being conducted to permanently fill that position, but he does not know the details. Senator Boynton remarked that she would hope the University would look for the best person that could be found to fill the position, who may be already at WIU but also may not be currently employed here. Associate Provost Russ Morgan explained that the Director for Equal Opportunity and Access has said that all internal searches are now to be advertised to all WIU employees. Chairperson Pynes asked if this new policy requires sending notification of every job search to every employee of WIU, including the Interim Provost. Interim Provost Clow confirmed that he received the notice as well.

Senator Allison would like for the administration to rethink this new policy. She wonders if Faculty Senate should take up the question of internal searches for Unit A tenure track positions because that seems like a big shift from previous practice. Senator Allison observed that it seems as if WIU is becoming increasingly internalized. She agrees that it might look bad to advertise nationally while laying off employees, but she also thinks that if WIU is to stay viable as a University it is important to keep new ideas coming in. She thinks that the more internalized WIU becomes, the more difficult it will be to think about new options. Chairperson Pynes stated that Faculty Senate could request that the Interim Provost be clearer about how searches are advertised when new searches are approved. He noted that normally the dean recommends whether a search should be internal or external, then sends the recommendation on to the Provost's office. Interim Provost Clow said he would like to find out why this policy has suddenly been changed as well. Senator Allison asked if there is a place for Faculty Senate to discuss the movement toward so many internal searches. Chairperson Pynes replied that he will add it to the Executive Committee agenda to discuss further with the Interim Provost.

Senator Allison asked what is being done for recruitment, either inside or outside Sherman Hall, since it is currently the height of recruitment season. Vice President for Student Services Ron Williams replied that WIU is actually now on the end of its recruitment cycle, and high school visits have concluded. He added that admissions recruiters are, however, continually reaching out to students – cultivating relationships with students they have already been interacting with and reaching out to potential students through digital marketing, geo-fencing, and things of that nature. Vice President Williams told senators that Director of University Marketing Suzy Pritchard is doing a great job gathering data points about who is seeing WIU's marketing materials, when they see them, and how much time individuals are spending on WIU's webpages and advertisements. He told senators that WIU is trending ahead of where it was last year in terms of Summer Orientation and Registration (SOAR) numbers and housing deposits but is down in actual applications. Vice President Williams thinks that SOAR registrations and housing deposits are better indicators than applications, many of which come from the common app; if SOAR registrations and housing deposits continue on the upswing, he is hopeful that WIU will stabilize

and even see an uptick in new freshmen, although not in total enrollment because that will take awhile longer.

Vice President Williams told senators that Admissions this year is trying to put out a lot more “kitchen table information” Admissions has also expanded the range of ACT and SAT names that they are purchasing so that they already have sophomores, juniors, and seniors in the pipeline. Admissions is doing a lot more digitally, but they also hear from parents about the need to have paper pieces going out as well. These paper materials are not sent to faculty or departments because Admissions is trying to only order what they need in order to maintain expenses, but Vice President Williams said that the materials are beautiful, and faculty can stop by Admissions to see them if they wish. He said that while WIU’s paper materials do not play the “Rocky” song like some flyers from other institutions, they are very elaborate books that cost the University \$10 each. Senator Rahman stated that her son is in high school and does not want to attend college very far away, but although he has been getting tons of mail from more than 20 universities he is still waiting to receive something from WIU. Vice President Williams expressed surprise at this, stating that a lot of people have stopped him around Macomb to tell him what a great piece the booklet is, so he will need to figure out what is going on. He added that WIU used to purchase only the middle range of ACT scores – from 18 to 27 – but they now purchase the entire range, from 16 to 36.

Senator Allison asked why Admissions made the decision to no longer use the common app; Vice President Williams replied that the University could no longer afford it. He explained that the common app is expensive, and most schools in Illinois have pulled out of it. He added that the number of students who came to WIU through the common app was extremely small, and it cost the University about \$8 per applicant.

Senator Tasdan asked when WIU began buying ACT and SAT names and whether the University has done this in previous years; Vice President Williams replied that Admissions has been buying the names for at least the ten years he has been at WIU. Senator Tasdan asked if Admissions has statistics regarding how students learn about WIU – what percentage of replies are received from the brochure or other marketing materials, recommendations from friends, or other means, or whether that can be traced. Angela Bonifas, Director for Institutional Research and Planning (IRP), replied that Admissions probably has that information; her office does not look at that, but Admissions can work with Administration Information Management Services (AIMS) to get that data. Ms. Bonifas added that only 10 to 11 percent of WIU students were admitted through the common app, and of those that did not enroll 70 to 80 percent had their application fee waived; thus, students were receiving a free service and applying to WIU but did not intend to attend. She offered to look into the yield question for Senator Tasdan and get back to Faculty Senate on that. Vice President Williams stated that by means of the freshman survey Admissions has found that students do often hear about WIU by word-of-mouth. He added that two years ago it was determined that students come to WIU for 1) academic programs and faculty, 2) cost, 3) financial aid, and also because they knew someone who had gone to WIU or was currently at WIU. Senator Dimitrov asked how many freshmen participated in the survey; Ms. Bonifas replied that the entire freshman class was surveyed, and there was a high response rate.

C. Student Government Association – No report

D. Other Announcements

1. Two petitions were received for a vacant seat on Faculty Senate for Spring 2019. Ballots were sent via email to eligible faculty on the Macomb campus on Monday, February 4 to vote for a Macomb Senator At-Large. Edmund Asari, Foreign Languages and Literatures, and Heidi Elbe, Speech Pathology and Audiology, submitted petitions to fill the vacant seat. Ballots must be returned no later than Monday, February 18.

Election notices will be emailed to faculty in the near future for three-year vacancies on Faculty Senate beginning Fall 2019.

2. Alphonso Simpson, Chair of the Department of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Professor of African American Studies, is mentoring nine students who will present at the National Council for Black Studies Conference on March 6-9 in New Orleans, LA. The students will also present their papers in Morgan Hall 101A on Feb 20 and Feb 27 from 6-8 p.m.; faculty and students are invited to attend.

Dr. Simpson is also the Vice President of the National Council for Black Studies. Dr. Simpson writes: "All nine of them submitted very detailed abstracts and were selected to present their research alongside undergraduate, graduate and professional Black Studies scholars from all over the country at the 43rd Annual Conference as we celebrate 50 years of Black Studies in 2019. The students who have been selected through a national committee reviewed process (in no particular order) are:

Jessica Ngoie - MLAS
Michael Cross - LAS - AAS/PSY/COMM
Angel Harris - LAS - AAS/WS/LEJA
Quavon Norris - LEJA/COMM
Nashuba Hudson - AAS/POLS
Haley Cullen - PHIL/SOC
Essence Elms - COMM/MKTG
Brianna Williams - CSP
Ramat Dada - AAS/HSM

I am very proud of each of these students as they are working diligently to represent LAS/MLAS/AAS/CAS/WIU and their respective departments well."

3. Margarita Sotelo, a senior in Political Science, is doing an internship with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus this semester in Washington, D.C.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

A. Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction (CCPI) (Anita Hardeman, Chair)

1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences

a. Request for New Course

- i. DS 494, Internship in Business Analytics, 1-12 s.h., repeatable to 12 s.h.

Senator Tasdan asked about the large number of possible semester hours. Interim Chair of the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences Tara Feld replied that students typically take three hours in the major or six hours with departmental approval, but there are Economics students who sometimes use internships as their electives and who want those to be transcribed because it is important for their future employment. Dr. Feld added, however, that she has only had one student who took 12 s.h. of internships in the 21 years she has been at WIU.

DS 494 APPROVED

- ii. DS 499, Individual Research in Business Analytics, 1-3 s.h., repeatable to 3 s.h.

DS 499 APPROVED

b. Request for Change of Minor

i. Business Analytics

Dr. Feld explained that the Business Analytics minor has existed for some years, but a year ago the Illinois Board of Higher Education approved a Business Analytics major, and more courses were created so that the major could have more variety and specified skills in that area of study. Senator Boynton asked why ECON 381, Economic Problem Solving, is being added to the Business Analytics major core but is not included for the minor since in the major rationale it states that ECON 381 “is essential for all business analytics students.” Dr. Feld responded that her department has gone back and forth about this decision. She related that when departmental representatives talk to corporate recruiters, the recruiters tell them that they like the statistical modeling and technical skills of business analytics DS courses, but they would like to have this complimented by the problem solving skills of economics. She stated that because the Business Analytics major is new, the department has seen a lot of Economics majors minoring in Business Analytics, so they have already been getting those types of courses; the department has thought about adding ECON 381 to the minor but has not integrated it at this point because they think students may get this type of skill set anyway.

Senator Allison stated that this shift in courses makes sense to her, but she finds it striking that Sociology and Psychology have been dropped as Directed Electives from the minor. She asked what the courses added to the Directed Electives are providing that the existing ones did not. Dr. Feld replied that because the department only offered a small amount of Business Analytics courses up to this point, they have been trying to be more interdisciplinary in finding courses with similar skill sets but have found that students were not choosing to take courses outside the College of Business and Technology. She added that since students were mostly taking business courses, they were oftentimes unable to meet the prerequisites for the SOC 323, SOC 324, PSY 223, and PSY 323 Directed Electives. The department made the decision to add in more Economics courses as well as a couple of Computer Science courses because recruiters say that students need some coding background.

Senator Allison said she understands why, if no students were taking the SOC and PSY courses, the department would be justified in taking them out, but this seems to fly in the face of the movement toward more interdisciplinary offerings, so it kind of alarms her. Dr. Feld said she understands Senator Allison’s position. She added that the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences would like to offer a Bachelor of Science in Business Analytics with a specialization in healthcare and sports analytics in future, but for now only a small group of students are taking the Psychology and Sociology Directed Electives on the Business side. Dr. Feld added she is not opposed to leaving the PSY and SOC courses in as Directed Electives if that is what Faculty Senate prefers. She has been trying to encourage her Bachelor of Arts in Economics students to minor in Business Analytics, and those students would be more likely able to choose the PSY and SOC Directed Electives because they may have had the prereqs.

Senator Allison stated she would prefer the SOC and PSY courses be kept in as Directed Electives, pointing out that senators keep hearing about the push for cross-college and interdisciplinary programs. Dr. Feld stated that more choices are fine by her department. Chairperson Pynes stated that

someone would need to object to the minor and then it restore it to the agenda if such a change were to be made.

SENATOR ALLISON OBJECTED TO THE MINOR

Senator Dimitrov asked why DS 485, Big Data for Business Decision Making, is being added as a Directed Elective. Dr. Feld responded that the department is trying to work on the applied side of business analytics and wants their students to do a lot of algorithmic programming or techniques. She stated that students are learning applied business skills, such as web scraping, so the department wanted to leave in the more technical courses. She added that the minor is very focused on the data science side.

Motion: To restore the Business Analytics Minor to the agenda (Franken/Tarrant)

MOTION TO RESTORE APPROVED 16 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB

Senator Allison said she would like the request taken back somewhere; Chairperson Pynes suggested the traditional place for this to be reconsidered would be to take the request back to CCPI. Chairperson Pynes observed that Senator Allison wants the Directed Electives to be more varied. Dr. Feld stated that her department is not opposed to this.

Motion: To send the request back to CCPI (Allison/Rahman)

Chairperson Pynes restated that the motion is to send the request back to CCPI for consideration to maintain some of the current Directed Electives; Senator Rahman pointed out that the discussion has only centered on maintaining the four Sociology and Psychology courses. Dr. Feld reiterated that her department is not opposed to this; they had just wanted the catalog list to be shorter and thought that these courses might be good to remove since no students were taking them.

Senator Maskarinec asked whether, given that the department is amenable to adding the four courses back in, Faculty Senate could approve the request with the stipulation that the Psychology and Sociology courses remain as Directed Electives. Chairperson Pynes said that it would be possible to do this as a friendly amendment if Senator Allison agrees to it; Senator Allison **accepted the suggestion as a friendly amendment.**

MOTION WITH FRIENDLY AMENDMENT APPROVED 16 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB

Chairperson Pynes stated that the change to the minor is approved with the stipulation that the Sociology and Psychology courses remain in Directed Electives.

- c. Request for Change of Major
 - i. Business Analytics

Dr. Feld explained that the change was mostly due to the addition of the internship course.

CHANGE OF MAJOR APPROVED

- 2. Curricular Requests from the School of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration

- a. Request for New Course
 - i. FS 303, Leading Community Risk Reduction, 3 s.h.

FS 303 APPROVED

Chairperson Pynes passed the gavel to Vice Chair McIlvaine-Newsad and left the meeting.

- b. Request for Change of Major
 - i. Fire Protection Services

Senator Tasdan asked why KIN 346, Candidate Physical Ability Test Preparation for Firefighters, was added to the Fire Science option. Law Enforcement and Justice Administration (LEJA) professor Scott Walker explained that last fall the school, in cooperation with the Department of Kinesiology, developed a new course that will prepare future firefighters for the physical demands of the profession and the standardized national test. He stated that when the course was jointly developed, it was LEJA's intention to add it to this major, so this is simply a matter of housekeeping. He added that since FS 303 was being added to the program, it seemed a good time to add KIN 346 to the Directed Electives for the Fire Science option as well.

CHANGE OF MAJOR APPROVED

3. Curricular Requests from the Department of Psychology

- a. Request for New Minor
 - i. Mental Health

Senator Boynton observed that she was surprised to discover that WIU did not already have this minor because it seems the University should have one. Psychology professor Jonathan Hammersley explained that Psychology has had a minor in Substance Abuse for a number of years, and this will replace that one. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad agreed with Senator Boynton that this minor is much needed. Senator Tasdan asked if Psychology has a counselor for WIU students in the department. Dr. Hammersley replied that Psychology does have a clinic which is intended to train graduate students in their program.

NEW MINOR APPROVED

4. Curricular Requests from the Department of Engineering Technology

- a. Requests for New Courses
 - i. CSTM 234, Construction Systems and Concepts, 3 s.h.

Senator Boynton asked for an explanation of the course justification in the Student Needs to be Served section: "CSTM major students in either option or the minor now will get the benefit of courses from both options, thus making their education more broad and encompassing to facilitate more career options." Engineering Technology professor Denise Gravitt explained that this course will replace two other courses.

CSTM 234 APPROVED

Chairperson Pynes returned to the meeting and retrieved the gavel.

- ii. CSTM 434, Construction and Facilities Management, 3 s.h.

CSTM 434 APPROVED

- b. Request for Change of Minor
 - i. Construction Technology

Senator Boynton asked if CSTM 356, Introduction to Power Systems, is being deleted entirely or just removed from this program. Dr. Gravitt responded that it is being removed from this program; it cannot be deleted at this time because it is cross-listed with ET 356.

CHANGE OF MINOR APPROVED

- c. Request for Change of Major
 - i. Construction Management

CHANGE OF MAJOR APPROVED

5. Curricular Requests from the School of Computer Sciences

- a. Request for New Course
 - i. CS 210, Python for Data Exploration, 3 s.h.

CS 210 APPROVED

- b. Requests for New Minors
 - i. Algorithms and Data Management
 - ii. App Development

NEW MINORS APPROVED

- c. Request for Change of Minor
 - i. Computer Science

Senator Boynton observed that on p. 2 the rationale states that the term “microcomputer” is out of date, but the title of CS 301 includes that term. She asked if that will be changed. Computer Sciences professor Jim McQuillan confirmed that the school is planning on making that change.

CHANGE OF MINOR APPROVED

B. Writing Instruction in the Disciplines (WID) Committee (Nathan Miczo, Chair)

- 1. Request for WID Designation
 - a. PHIL 300, History of Ancient Philosophy, 3 s.h.

WID DESIGNATION APPROVED

C. Senate Nominating Committee
(Ginny Boynton, Chair)

1. Nominations of Faculty

SENATE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES:

Writing Instruction in the Disciplines (WID) Committee

Doug LaFountain, Math/Phil	replacing	Leslie Melim	Spr 2019 only	A&S
Rich Musser, Biology	replacing	Kim McClure	Spr 2019 only	A&S

UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES:

Immigration Task Force

Miguel Narvaez, Kinesiology	replacing	Sarah Schoper	E&HS
-----------------------------	-----------	---------------	------

There were no further nominations, and the slate of candidates was declared elected.

IV. Old Business – None

V. New Business

Motion: To consider item V.B., WIU Income/Expenditure Comparison, before item V.A. (Hyde/Rahman)

MOTION APPROVED 14 YES – 2 NO – 0 AB

B. WIU Income/Expenditure Comparison

Chairperson Pynes stated that the Senate Executive Committee put the document together after a lot of discussion with various University administrators and Trustee Lester. He added that senators and others have had the report for a week, and all senators, including those in the Quad Cities, received a digital copy of the report on Monday, February 4. Senator Dimitrov observed that it is 4:58 p.m. now, so there are only two minutes left for discussion. Chairperson Pynes clarified that Faculty Senate has the room until 5:30, and at that time the meeting will come to an end.

Senator Hyde asked for a summary of the document. Chairperson Pynes related that the Senate Executive Committee, in various guises over the past four years, has been asking for different ways to evaluate the two campuses. He recalled that the origin of this request was when a faculty member who no longer works at WIU asked how much student credit hour (SCH) production was generated by Macomb faculty for the Quad Cities campus -- how much is spent to send faculty from Macomb to teach at WIUQC – and wanted a cost comparison. Chairperson Pynes related that when the Executive Committee continued to ask for this information, they were told by the administration that they were working on it. He stated that at the June 2018 Board of Trustees meeting, Trustee Lester, who is a banker, asked why he cannot get a balance sheet for both campuses and for the total campus, which Chairperson Pynes said was a pretty important question to ask because nobody had made that information public in the past. Chairperson Pynes sent an email to Trustee Lester thanking him for raising this question and expressing a desire see what this information looks like. Chairperson Pynes stated that after the decision by the Public Access Counselor (PAC) that the Board of Trustees violated the Open Meetings Act and the audio of the June 2018 meeting was made public, it was learned that a “board tracking document” existed which included a line indicating that Trustee Lester had also been given the cost comparison report, even though Chairperson Pynes had been told that it did not exist. Chairperson Pynes said he submitted a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the document because WIU is a public institution, and this information is something that everyone should be able to know.

Chairperson Pynes stated that Trustee Lester was kind with his time in meeting with the Executive Committee but wanted to understand the budget situation in a broader context. Chairperson Pynes said this is a complicated situation since students may take classes from either campus or from multiple campuses and pay different tuition rates, so there is a lot that goes into determining how much tuition money come into the University and which campus should be charged for different costs. He stated that Budget Director Letisha Trepac was concerned to make clear that if a cost should be shifted to one campus or the other, this involves a lot of bookkeeping work to make sure that the data is correct; Chairperson Pynes appreciates that a professional worked on this data and stressed that the Budget Office is still working on it for future analysis of the campuses.

Chairperson Pynes recounted that one of the key areas where he would consider there to be contention is that the IRP website includes a list of headcount and full-time equivalency (FTE) counted in four ways: Macomb, Macomb Extension, Quad Cities, and Quad Cities Extension. He related that the FTE is determined by taking the headcount for undergraduates divided by 15, and by taking the headcount for graduate students divided by 12. He observed that while FTE is always smaller than headcount, it is one way to evaluate how many students attend at each campus. Chairperson Pynes stated that there is a long rules sheet used to determine whether students are counted as Quad Cities, Quad Cities Extension, Macomb, or Macomb Extension for enrollment purposes.

Chairperson Pynes related that in addition to these ways of determining campus enrollment, there is also the SCH production chart for each fiscal year, which only lists three categories: Macomb, Quad Cities, and Extension. He thinks the question is who is responsible for the Extension SCH production, which is not easy to answer and requires one to have a good understanding, just like the difference between the budget and expenditures. He explained that a student's campus is determined based upon a set of rules; a Quad Cities student that takes all classes on campus at WIUQC can be determined quite simply, but when a student takes one class in person at WIUQC, one in the Quad Cities online, and one from a Macomb-based faculty member, it raises the question of who gets credit for the Macomb faculty member's SCH production for the student that is appropriately deemed a Quad Cities student. Chairperson Pynes asserted that there are a number of different ways that can be used to answer this question; one way is to use the enrollment rules to divide up all SCH production, which results in the division of 76 and 24, but that is only one way to determine this. He stated that currently when a Quad Cities student takes a course from a Macomb faculty member teaching an online class, the SCH is credited to the Quad Cities campus because it is the campus of the student based on the Enrollment Rules page, which seems to result in an overestimate of SCH production to WIUQC. He stated that the Executive Committee was trying to work with administrators to determine the best way to articulate this sort of situation, but there are several ways to do this analysis.

Chairperson Pynes related that the Budget Director determined that if all tuition dollars at all the different rates are distributed to the two campuses, based on the Enrollment Rules, it would result in 8 percent for the Quad Cities campus and 92 percent for Macomb, based on total tuition income. He stated that same metric can be applied to state funding and to cost expenditures to see how much each campus is making or losing, and there are a couple of ways that one can use to do that analysis. Chairperson Pynes stated that, looking at the different charts in the WIU Income/Expenditure Comparison document, one can look at just state appropriated funds and the University income fund and come up with an evaluation; adding in non-appropriated funds provides an additional metric. Chairperson Pynes told senators the Budget Director sent him a very large and meaty Excel file with many tabs and walked the Executive Committee through various ways of looking at the Quad Cities and Macomb expenditures by campus. He related, for example, there is a line on the document in the FY 18 Revenue & Expense chart in the University Income Funds column that says "Macomb Instruction & Travel," followed by another that says "Macomb Administrative Department Support" which, when combined, shows a cost shift of \$918,780; this number, which is listed as a negative amount on the Macomb campus chart and as a positive amount on the Quad Cities chart, is intended to articulate where this money is going and how it is being used. Chairperson Pynes stated that the Executive Committee realized that by looking at these budget numbers in one way, it can be interpreted that WIUQC is losing money at 12 times

the Macomb campus, and when looked at another way WIUQC is responsible for 123 percent of the total losses of WIU.

Chairperson Pynes noted that the charts included in the document also show how much SCH the Quad Cities campus produces in person, so one can get a much better picture of where the money is going and how it is generated. He believes that once one gets to this point, it is possible to start having discussions about what programs the University should have and whether WIU should reinvest money in certain areas. Chairperson Pynes expressed his irritation that the state built a branch campus for WIU but did not provide any extra money for its maintenance and continued support. He observed that former Senate Parliamentarian Janna Deitz told him that Western Carolina University was offered a multimillion dollar building, but, when the university found out that they would not receive additional appropriated money to maintain it, they decided they could not afford to take on the additional maintenance costs, which is similar to what happened to WIU. Chairperson Pynes observed that WIU took on a new campus at a time of declining enrollments and budgets, and the University is now trying to shift its priorities about what programs it wants to have on both campuses and, more broadly, at the University.

Chairperson Pynes related that when he had the idea to create a Senate Budget Transparency Committee three years ago, he hoped they would be able to do this kind of analysis, to dig in and look at real information from Institutional Research and Planning and the Budget Office to see how money is being allocated at WIU. He thinks this would allow the University to fix the narrative when asking for appropriated money from the state. Chairperson Pynes believes that if this is not done right, it does a disservice to ourselves as a university. He stated that the cost comparison document is an attempt to provide a clear picture about what is going on at WIU; while it is not perfect, it is the first real effort.

Senator Zbeeb observed that there appears to be no breakdown of the state allocations; it shows that all funds from the state go to Macomb, but the Quad Cities Manufacturing Lab gets \$600,000 from the state. Senator Zbeeb pointed out that if there was no Manufacturing Lab, WIU would lose the \$600,000 allocation, and he wonders why this money is not being counted for the Quad Cities campus. He understands that the document is an attempt to find out if the Quad Cities campus is profitable, but he would like to see a specific breakdown of overall expenses and all allocations because some, such as the Manufacturing Lab which was built last year, do not seem to show up in the document. Senator Zbeeb asked if the reason this is not showing up on the document is because it is considered Foundation money. He stressed that if revenue is being considered, it should show everything because otherwise the report does not reflect real thinking, and this is how most of the faculty and administrators at WIUQC see it. He would like answers at least in regards to the Quad Cities Manufacturing Lab.

Budget Director Trepac confirmed that the \$600,000 that was appropriated to the University for the Manufacturing Lab was given to WIU; Vice President Rives clarified that this was about five years ago. Ms. Trepac explained that this \$600,000 appropriation was rolled into WIU's regular state appropriation. She added that WIU has never received a separate appropriation for the Manufacturing Lab on top of the University's regular appropriation since the first time. Chairperson Pynes asked if this means that there would be no separate line item of \$600,000 for that lab; Ms. Trepac confirmed this is correct. Ms. Trepac acknowledged that there has been an incremental change every year since receipt of those funds because of budget cuts and reductions. She related that she tried to allocate the state appropriation for this document using the best logic that she could since there are multiple ways this could be done; she felt the best method was to use an 92 percent Macomb and 8 percent WIUQC ratio. Senator Zbeeb asked if this means that WIUQC only received the funds one time five years ago; he has understood that the funding has been provided every year. Ms. Trepac confirmed that the funding is provided every year but explained that it is rolled into the total state appropriation; no additional line item has been provided for this funding since it was first received. Vice President Rives asked if the funding is now part of the institutional base; Ms. Trepac confirmed this is correct.

Senator Zbeeb expressed surprise that the \$600,000 is divided based on an 8/92 percent ratio when the money is solely used for the Quad Cities Manufacturing Lab, which he believes makes this

estimate incorrect. Ms. Trepac explained that the University is not receiving \$600,000 separate every year for the Manufacturing Lab. School of Engineering Director Bill Pratt pointed out that the first year the funding was approved, WIU received an additional \$600,000, and from that time on it became an increase in the baseline budget, which does not show up from year to year even though it is received yearly. He added that although this does not show as a separate line item, it was an increase. Ms. Trepac stressed that the money became part of the base; the University receives one state appropriation. Dr. Pratt observed that when WIU's base began to decrease, WIUQC was decreased by the same percentage or a little more. Ms. Trepac stated that the Budget Office has never adjusted the Manufacturing Lab operating or personnel budget based on the increase or decrease in state appropriations, but the Manufacturing Lab probably did experience the same 25 percent reduction to the base that the rest of the University experienced. Dr. Pratt confirmed this is the case.

Senator Zbeeb pointed out that although the money for the Manufacturing Lab is included in the appropriation, it is only allocated for the Lab, and if the Quad Cities Manufacturing Lab did not exist, WIU would not receive this money. Chairperson Pynes responded that Ms. Trepac is trying to explain that the \$600,000 is not something new that WIUQC is receiving any more but that whatever has made up that cost has become part of the overall University budget; it is not shown as additional money but has been absorbed by the University. Chairperson Pynes announced there are only ten minutes left in the meeting; he stated his intention to go around the table to first call on senators who wish to comment.

Senator Perabo stated that while the Budget Transparency Committee (BTC) did not have advance knowledge of the WIU Income/Expenditure Comparison document, she thinks it is an interesting start. She acknowledged that she understands Senator Zbeeb's concern, which was also discussed at yesterday's BTC meeting. She thinks Senator Zbeeb's concern is that the method of analysis of the Quad Cities campus seems not to take into account the sources of funding that are specifically designated for Quad Cities-based programs; if the Moline Foundation gives WIUQC \$2 million, for example, that money never comes to the Macomb campus. She recognizes that there are things specifically going to WIUQC that the Macomb campus is not getting funding for, such as the Manufacturing Lab and perhaps other specific grant funding. Senator Perabo agrees that it is good to analyze this data, but there are a number of things externally funded at WIUQC, and as the data is analyzed that is something that needs to be factored into the analysis in terms of the value of the Quad Cities campus versus the Macomb campus.

Chairperson Pynes stated that while he understands Senator Perabo's point, the Budget Director's point is that there are no new appropriations for the Manufacturing Lab; the funds that were received have been absorbed more generally into the regular university budget. He suggested that WIUQC might even be worse off if the \$600,000 were pulled out as an added cost. Ms. Trepac reiterated that there is one state appropriation, which for this document was determined based on an 8 percent and 92 percent division, which she realizes could be argued. She explained that when WIUQC received the \$600,000 for the Manufacturing Lab, WIUQC's state appropriation that Ms. Trepac would have allocated to it would have gone up as well. She added that grants are reflected in the Other income column, and Foundation funds are a separate entity; the amounts for Foundation funds would have to be obtained from the Foundations Office. Chairperson Pynes added that this is why when ExCo did the analysis, they did it in two ways: one with (a) state appropriated and (b) university income funds, and a second way with (a) state appropriated, (b) university income funds, and (c) non-appropriated funds because incorporating non-appropriated funds changes the analysis. He stressed that this document does not represent an attempt to blame a campus but is an attempt to understand where the University spends money, makes money, and makes decisions about how to make and spend money at WIU.

Senator Allison asked why Faculty Senate had to FOIA this information and who decided that Faculty Senate should not see it initially. Chairperson Pynes replied that this is opaque to the Executive Committee, but this topic has come up. Senator Dimitrov asked who Chairperson Pynes asked when he was told that no such report exists and who he ultimately received it from. Chairperson Pynes replied that since the Executive Committee generally meets with the Provost, he asked the question of former Interim Provost Neumann and continued to ask it of her. He said

that former Interim Provost Neumann continued to tell ExCo that the report was in progress, and so ExCo continued to wait. Chairperson Pynes added that he has no reason to doubt that the report was in progress when former Interim Provost Neumann said that it was because it is very complicated and time consuming.

Regarding the Quad Cities Manufacturing Lab, Senator Dimitrov stated that the University could balance every single entity and perhaps balance the funds allocated to the Lab and the revenue generated from the Lab, that that is a different question. He observed that Faculty Senate is now discussing the Macomb and Quad Cities campuses according to the definitions that the Executive Committee, to the best of their knowledge, obtained, and these are the numbers. He added that if the discussion is to be about the Quad Cities Manufacturing Lab, Faculty Senate should perhaps discuss the revenues and efficiencies of the Lab by itself, but that is not the question right now. Senator Zbeeb observed that if WIU does not have a Quad Cities Manufacturing Lab, it does not have the \$600,000, which is why this document does not make sense to him.

Senator Hyde asked what the intention of the report is. She noted that Chairperson Pynes has said the Quad Cities campus must be evaluated, and she wonders what he imagines is going to happen there. Senator Tasdan said his question is the same. Chairperson Pynes stated that WIU is in a time of declining enrollments and making decisions about programs that are being eliminated or in which there will be reinvestment, and those are decisions that have to be made together as a university. He stated that if the Quad Cities campus were being evaluated as a program, like Mathematics, Anthropology, Art, or English, it would be on the APER list. Chairperson Pynes thinks it is partly the fault of the University that the Quad Cities campus has not gotten its own appropriation; if WIU wants a Quad Cities campus, he believes it needs money to support it. He stated that the campus is not growing and has fewer students than it did ten years ago, just like the Macomb campus, and unless it can be determined what is working at WIUQC, where money is going, and how money should be allocated for each campus, it is difficult to make appropriate decisions. He stated that this document represents an attempt to get the administration and Faculty Senate talking together about the vision for WIU -- not for WIU-Quad Cities or WIU-Macomb but for Western Illinois University. Chairperson Pynes believes that if WIUQC is a viable campus, as he has been told for a decade, then WIU needs the appropriations to support it and make it viable; if this money is not forthcoming, then a conversation needs to occur about what can be done well at WIUQC and whether it is worth paying for those things. He stressed that the same conversation needs to occur about the Macomb campus; a conversation needs to occur about whether, for example, Clinical Lab Science, which is on the APER list, is a viable program. Chairperson Pynes stressed that no one -- from the President down to the department chairs -- can make good decisions if there is not enough good information about what they are doing. He observed that if a kid is given a credit card set up for autopay and told to use it when he needs it, the parent's bank account may soon be zero after the kid buys a Ferrari, which is similar to what is going on at WIU, which basically has expenses set up on autopay and does not know what is being spent on things. Chairperson Pynes stated that he expects more than this from his leadership and does not want this to continue to occur because the University needs to move forward.

Senator Tasdan asked if the President's September 20, 2018 announcement of the Illinois Innovation Network, which would involve the Quad Cities campus, has any connection with the WIU Income/Expenditure Comparison report. Chairperson Pynes responded that it does not. He announced that since it is 5:30 and Faculty Senate no longer has the room, the meeting must come to an end.

A. Budget Transparency Committee Policies and Procedures

This item was not considered due to time constraints.

C. For the Good of the Body – None

Motion: To adjourn (Bellott)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Susan Czechowski, Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary



Hamm, Annette <ae-hamm@wiu.edu>

Re: February 14th Faculty Senate - Income/Expenditure Comparison

1 message

Pynes, Christopher <ca-pynes@wiu.edu>

Mon, Feb 18, 2019 at 8:11 AM

To: "Savala, Yvonne" <y-savala@wiu.edu>

Cc: Todd Lester <tv-lester@wiu.edu>, Letisha Trepac <lk-trepac@wiu.edu>, Angela Bonifas <aj-bonifas@wiu.edu>, William Polley <wj-polley@wiu.edu>, Jack Thomas <j-thomas2@wiu.edu>, Joseph Rives <j-rives@wiu.edu>, Annette E Hamm <AE-Hamm@wiu.edu>

Bcc: AE-Hamm@wiu.edu

Dear Trustee Savala,

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has written a reply to your confusing memo of 14 February 2014. It is attached as a PDF. I am including all those who you cc-ed, and I am blind copying all the Faculty Senators. Why do I send emails to Senators with bcc? Because our discussions should be done on the floor and I don't want to encourage long email chains. The reply should be to me or bring the discussion to the senate floor where it belongs.

Additionally ExCo deems this correspondence of Faculty Senate business worthy of being appended to the minutes of its meeting of February 14, 2019. So your memo and the ExCo reply will be part of the formal record.

If you desire to continue the discussion, then I invite you to our Senate meeting on Tuesday, 19 February 2019.

On Behalf of ExCo,
Christopher

Christopher Pynes, Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy &
Chair, Faculty Senate
Department of Mathematics & Philosophy
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455-1390

Phone: 309.298.1467

Do You Philosophize!?!

On Thu, Feb 14, 2019 at 10:18 PM Savala, Yvonne <y-savala@wiu.edu> wrote:

Attached is a Memo I am hopeful you will read.

Thank you,

Yvonne Savala

 **Savala Memo Reply ExCo 18Feb2019.pdf**
63K

18 February 2018

Dear Trustee Savala,

Your memo of February 14, 2019 demonstrates a basic lack of understanding of how the university functions and how shared governance works in a university setting. Some corrections of the basic facts in your memo need to be clarified.

(1) President Thomas DID know there was a Faculty Senate meeting on the 14th. In fact, he is the only person, other than the Chair of the Senate, who can call a meeting of the Faculty Senate on their own. He was also hand delivered, on 2/4/19, a copy of the report being discussed.

(2) The Interim Provost and Academic Vice President, Billy Clow, who is the Provost for the entire university (including the QC) had a copy of the report on January 29th.

(3) ExCo finds it interesting that you believe NO ONE in our meeting was able to understand the context of the Quad Cities and provide history. ExCo believes that not a single BOT member could explain how the budget is allocated, how students are counted by campus, how SCH production is counted between the campuses before Lester requested this information. If you can't do these important calculations, then you can't actually understand the problems that this report is addressing. It is a sign of significant hubris that you don't think anyone not part of the QC could understand the cost of the campus.

It is even more troubling that you don't consider anyone in Macomb as a part of the Quad Cities even though (as the report demonstrates), Macomb faculty provide for a considerable amount of instruction to QC students. We believe that further transparency to determine the exact amount of this instructional contribution between campuses is important for evaluating campuses, programs, and faculty productivity.

(4) The setting of budget ratios is not a right, but a responsibility. Let us provide you with two examples. First, let's take a cost to the university that is basic and simple: producing the undergraduate catalog. How much of that cost should the QC campus absorb? If you think 0\$, then you support the QC campus free riding on the Macomb campus for the production of the undergraduate catalog. If you support such free riding, you clearly can't be an honest broker in these budget discussions. If you think the QC should pay for half (since it is one of two campuses), then the cost of the QC would increase! Second, let's examine the role of uTech. It is our understanding that uTech employees from Macomb maintain not only the technology on the Macomb campus, but also on the QC campus. How should those salaries be split between the campuses? Both of these examples show that the QC can be evaluated as more or less expensive depending on how much of their support they consider a cost. Or you could say, that since the QC produced 8% of the tuition revenue for FY 2018 (that's a FACT, not an opinion), then they should get 8% of the appropriated budget and related costs of things like uTech and the production of the undergraduate catalog.

This is, of course, a budget analysis decision, but it's one that is in good company. IBHE uses similar funding methods. When we got additional stopgap money, IBHE divided the pool of money between universities by a similar ratio calculation. So, this is not an arbitrary method of evaluating the campuses. If you have a better method for how the cost accounting should be done, then we would certainly entertain a discussion.

(5) My timeline for ExCo's request for the budget info is accurate. The patience for the data stems from the fact that it isn't easy to get. ExCo can't force the budget director to do work that they haven't done. It wasn't until Trustee Lester asked for the info in a public setting that it was produced. And I was even told that it didn't exist by the administration when it in fact did. It's really hard to get information when it is deliberately kept from you.

The speed at which we wrote the report was due in large part to the fact that programs are being evaluated for elimination, faculty and staff are about to be laid off, 5 million dollars in expenditures are being cut this year, and understanding the budget of both campuses is still something that most people on both campuses don't understand. ***Understanding the budget has to be part of any justified decision making procedure.*** If you don't agree to that, then you don't understand the point of a budget and you should recuse yourself from any budget related votes as a BOT member.

(6) ExCo's report was about WIU. As far as ExCo understands the organization chart, the Provost is the most senior VP because we are an academic institution. The Provost and the President were both hand delivered copies of the report. How the report filters down to other VPs was not our concern. The QC has two faculty Senators and they both got digital versions of the report on the same day Macomb Senators got packets. Additionally, this is just a discussion item. There is nothing to vote on and no actions to be taken. We certainly weren't trying to keep it from anyone (other than the media – we denied three requests for the report.), and Chairperson Pynes emailed the report to Senior Vice President Rives when he indicated that he didn't have a copy.

(7) As for your four divisions, we feel the real division is between those who support transparent and responsible decision-making and those who don't. Unfortunately, based on the tone and content of your memo, it appears we have a fundamental division here.

Realize that the three Faculty Senate Officers are people who you as a trustee voted to lay off, with tenure, in 2015, whose program and department you voted as a trustee to eliminate in 2016, and whose program you are currently considering eliminating under APER. We have a serious interest in a transparent budget and in transparent decision-making. If your memo is to be believed, then the first two rounds of layoffs that affected the Macomb campus were partisan attacks on Macomb faculty. And if not, then this is an interesting double standard you have and it reveals that you are only interested in representing 8% of WIU and not the other 92% as well.

Moreover, as a WIU BOT Trustee, ExCo feels that you have **failed** in your responsibilities to promote and protect the entire university. Here is a link to the page listing your roles and responsibilities:

http://www.wiu.edu/board_of_trustees/University%20Board%20Roles%20and%20Responsibilities.pdf

ExCo views that you and other BOT members have failed in responsibilities 2, 6, 11d, and 11e. For your ease of reading your failed responsibilities include:

- 2. Maintain fiduciary oversight of the financial and legal obligations of the university.
- 6. Assure that the University works to secure adequate resources.
- 11. Be accountable for Board operations:
 - d. Establish and maintain methods to get or exchange information.
 - e. Prepare for meetings through reading and research as appropriate.

Why we claim these failures should be clear from the context of our report and this memo. But we do want to make one final comment about your personal views as a BOT member. Let's review your comment in the closed session meeting recording that was made public because you violated the Open Meetings Act; you can find the file at the following link: http://www.wiu.edu/general_counsel/notices/2018-11-05/audio.mp3

At the 48:54 mark, you ask to make one last comment: "But I think one thing that I'd like to say is that you know we've got what, 7-8000 students that are returning. I think that's 7 or 8000 families that support our leadership, our administration, and the Board of Trustees and what we're tryin' to do. And so, I think sometimes we forget about that." -- Y. Savala.

This comment is too obtuse to be believed. You can't seriously believe this, can you? Students don't attend a university because of the administration or the BOT; they attend for the faculty and the programs. We know that; you don't know that. This is one of the reason you have been a failed BOT member, and we sincerely hope the new governor replaces you with a competent BOT member.

(8) Finally, what kind of messages are we sending to families and students? It's simple. We want WIU to be a properly functioning, well-funded, institution of higher education. If you have objections to that goal, then you are part of the problem and need to step aside.

Signed,

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

Chair, Christopher Pynes (Professor of Philosophy)

Vice-Chair, Heather McIlvaine-Newsad (Professor of Anthropology)

Secretary, Susan Czechowski (Professor of Art)

Parliamentarian, Ilon Lauer (Professor of Communication)

To: Trustee Lester, Chairperson Pynes, Budget Director Letisha Trepac, Director of Institutional Research and Planning Angela Bonifas, Vice President of Administrative Services William Polley

xc: President Thomas, Senior Vice President Rives

Date: February 14, 2019

From: Trustee Savala

Re: Faculty/Senate Meeting 02/14/2019
WIU Income/Expenditure Comparison

I sincerely appreciate the invitation to attend the meeting of the Faculty Senate this date and am offering my comments.

First, I must share my disappointment of the way the meeting occurred as well as the distribution of the opinionated report. I am quite surprised that a meeting of this nature was held without the knowledge of the University President, and without the representation of pertinent Quad City personnel - at the very least the Senior Vice President. It was quite clear the study of the requested reports would lead to information and potential conclusions of which NO ONE in your meeting was able to provide history or interpretation on behalf of the Quad Cities; this was evident during the brief Q&A. It was further evident standards of neutrality were not upheld both in preparing the report and in the meeting. Finally, I understood it is no one's role to arbitrarily set budget ratios, but if I am mistaken please advise.

Chairperson Pynes indicated he had fought for years to get this information. This is unfortunate if indeed accurate and I would concur with Chairperson Pynes a FOIA should not have been necessary. However, I find it interesting that while patiently waiting for information for over three years, in just about a month such high-level analytics were disseminated, a meeting was arranged - without the knowledge of the President, Senior Vice President, or Quad City representation - and a report was distributed just a few days prior to a regularly scheduled meeting. Professional courtesy should have been offered and Quad City knowledge should have been included in this session.

As I reflected on the meeting February 14, 2019, the following was running through my mind. Why does Western Illinois University always have their boxing gloves on? We are our own worst enemy -

- We are union v. nonunion
- We are faculty v. staff
- We are Democrats v. Republicans
- We are Macomb v. Quad Cities

Why can't we all just be Leathernecks?

We need to think about what type of message are we sending to current students, families, and our communities who have and continue to make the most viable and valuable decision to support WIU.

Gracias,



Hamm, Annette <ae-hamm@wiu.edu>

Re:

1 message

Pynes, Christopher <ca-pynes@wiu.edu>

Mon, Feb 18, 2019 at 8:17 AM

To: "Rives, Joseph" <j-rives@wiu.edu>

Cc: Todd Lester <tv-lester@wiu.edu>, Letisha Trepac <lk-trepac@wiu.edu>, Angela Bonifas <aj-bonifas@wiu.edu>, William Polley <wj-polley@wiu.edu>, Jack Thomas <j-thomas2@wiu.edu>, Yvonne Savala <y-savala@wiu.edu>, "Williams, Ronald" <rc-williams@wiu.edu>, William Clow <wt-clow@wiu.edu>, Steven M Whan <SM-Whan@wiu.edu>, Audrey Adamson <anw-adamson@wiu.edu>, "Porter, Rob" <r-porter@wiu.edu>, Jesse Ramos <j-ramos2@wiu.edu>, Annette E Hamm <AE-Hamm@wiu.edu>

Bcc: AE-Hamm@wiu.edu

Dear Joe,

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has written replies to the 22 questions you submitted in the email below. It is attached as a PDF. I am including all those who you cc-ed, and I am blind copying all the Faculty Senators. Why do I send emails to Senators with bcc? Because our discussions should be done on the floor and I don't want to encourage long email chains. The reply should be to me or bring the discussion to the senate floor where it belongs.

Additionally ExCo deems this correspondence of Faculty Senate business worthy of being appended to the minutes of its meeting of February 14, 2019. So the questions and the ExCo replies will be part of the formal record.

If you desire to continue the discussion, then I invite you to our Senate meeting on Tuesday, 19 February 2019.

On behalf of ExCo,
Christopher

Christopher Pynes, Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy &
Chair, Faculty Senate
Department of Mathematics & Philosophy
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455-1390

Phone: 309.298.1467

Do You Philosophize!?!

On Fri, Feb 15, 2019 at 5:02 PM Rives, Joseph <j-rives@wiu.edu> wrote:

Last night we received an email from Trustee Savala regarding her concerns over the 2.14.19 Faculty Senate meeting. Since that meeting, I have been hearing concerns from students, faculty, and staff. Calls went on until midnight last night (I am in Alabama) and calls continued all day today.

The purpose of this e-mail is to provide you with a summary of quoted concerns, with the permission of those who expressed concerns. I do this because my consistent message to those discussing issues with me is that university protocol must be followed, i.e., the individual needs to go to the person with concern, and if not resolved at that level to the supervisor for which they have concerns and up the organization chart, until resolution. Hence the cc's to the VPs and those engaged in Quad Cities governance since there were several questions about "if it is okay to discuss this with my governance leaders who serve in the Quad Cities?"

I do not have a role as a middle man in these discussions. The quoted concerns noted below are for your context in case you have/had people come to you. I did receive permission to pass these along. However, it would be an ethical and moral violation to say who said what.

Please know that the quoted concerns (below) do not represent my insight or evaluation of the meeting or of the issues. Nor do I find it appropriate to have discussions regarding if these concerns are right or wrong, or to have further e-mail conversations on this email.

I only provide background information of calls received so you have context and are not blind-sided. People are unsettled by the recent staff reclassifications, impending layoffs, APER, and emotions run high. As Senior Vice President who oversees the Quad Cities campus, I feel it is my professional and social responsibility to pass along the voice of this constituency.

Quoted Concerns Expressed:

1. "Why is a Trustee, Chairperson of the Faculty Senate and Director of IR clearly trying to pit one campus against another?"
2. "What gives three people the right to set budget ratios? And when one of those persons does not work in fiscal affairs"
3. "Why is there no Quad Cities representation on the Faculty Senate Budget Transparency Committee?"
4. "Why is the Faculty Senate Chairperson telling faculty that the Senior Vice President no longer oversees the Quad Cities campus?. He has said this to people in Macomb and the Quad Cities"
5. "Are people aware how damaging a public debate like this is to enrollment and retention?"
6. "Why are people in Macomb wanting to close where I go to school?"
- 7 "I though Institutional Research was supposed to be neutral when providing data? How can we trust that office, now and or in the future?"
8. "Why would the Institutional Research person say they would do admissions analysis since we only have an interim admissions director. Does she know how long that person has worked at WIU? Why was such a derogatory remark made about this employee and was this comment not ruled a personal attack?"
9. "Why are a couple of people using the Faculty Senate floor for personal agendas?"
10. "Why did the Faculty Senate Chair acknowledge that the data were only a first attempt at analysis--and then make a flippant remark that the Quad Cities causes a 123% of the deficit? Who validated the analysis?"
11. "Programs not campuses fall under APER,"
12. "I know that administration and faculty not always see eye to eye, but this is ridiculous and an embarrassment."
13. "Why was the Vice President who can explain the budgeting process left to stand at the microphone for 20 minutes and not allowed to talk?"
14. "Aren't we one university with two campuses?"
15. "How do the other Trustees feel about this unprofessional attack?"
16. "Are you (asked to me) worried that this hurts our accreditation efforts?"
17. "How can you say the analysis is based on university revenue and then say oh you would have to get that information from the Foundation. It is not included."
18. "Why was it not made clear the QCML monies, like any other new recurring monies are put in the University budget and roll forward year to year. The Faculty Senate Chairperson led people in the room that money was only received one time. He did not represent the facts."
19. "Why did the Faculty Senate Chairperson use the term Macomb has to absorb the Quad Cities costs? Aren't we one University?"
20. "Why did the Faculty Senate Chairperson seem to apply that the Quad Cities campus had no facilities workers when we came to Riverfront Hall? Did he think we had no janitorial services in the Quad Cities?" And did he ever stop to think to compare facilities costs against QCML School of Engineering revenue? One clearly outweighs the other."
21. "I heard there was a second document sent to the Faculty Senate by the Chairperson that tried to set context for this was not campuses against one another. If this is true, why did he not share that in his summary?"

22. "Is this what the Faculty Chairperson had in mind when he came to Faculty Council and talked about working together. By the way, his views of our campus were really off the day he came. He had no idea of the size of our faculty."

Thank you for your time on this email. Thank you too for understanding my intent is only information sharing for context-and not to upset, annoy, or elicit any other feelings or actions. I have dealt with a lot of emotions over the last 24 hours and hope that you find this information helpful if individuals come to you.
Joe



22 Rives Questions ExCo replies 18Feb2019.pdf

61K

Concerns Submitted to Senior Vice President Joe Rives and forwarded via email to ExCo on 15 February 2019

Replies by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (18 February 2019)

1. "Why is a Trustee, Chairperson of the Faculty Senate and Director of IR clearly trying to pit one campus against another?"

Answer by ExCo: We aren't trying to do that at all. The IPR director only provided data that the Trustee and ExCo requested independently of one another.

2. "What gives three people the right to set budget ratios? And when one of those persons does not work in fiscal affairs"

Answer by ExCo: The setting of budget ratio is not a right, but a responsibility. We are disappointed that the administration and BOT have avoided this fiduciary responsibility. Let us provide you with two examples to show the importance.

First, let's take a cost to the university that is basic and simple: producing the undergraduate catalog. How much of that cost should the QC campus absorb? If you think 0\$, then you support the QC campus free riding on the Macomb campus for the production of the undergraduate catalog. If you support such free riding, you clearly can't be an honest broker in these budget discussions. If you think the QC should pay for half (since it is one of two campuses), then the cost of the QC would increase! Second, let's examine the role of uTech. It is our understanding that uTech employees from Macomb maintain not only the technology on the Macomb campus, but also on the QC campus. How should those salaries be split between the campuses? Both of these examples show that the QC can be evaluated as more or less expensive depending on how much of their support they consider a cost. Or you could say, that since the QC produced 8% of the tuition revenue for FY 2018 (that's a FACT, not an opinion), then they should get 8% of the appropriated budget and related costs of things like uTech and the production of the undergraduate catalog.

This is, of course, a budget analysis decision, but it's one that is in good company. IBHE uses similar funding methods. When we got additional stopgap money, IBHE divided the pool of money by a similar calculation. So, this is not an arbitrary method of evaluating the campuses. If you have a better suggestion for how the cost accounting should be done, then we would certainly entertain such a discussion.

Moreover, Trustee Lester is on the BOT Budget subcommittee. So it's part of his responsibility as a BOT member to understand what's going on with the budget.

3. "Why is there no Quad Cities representation on the Faculty Senate Budget Transparency Committee?"

Answer by ExCo: Senator Zbeeb from the QC is on the BTC.

4. "Why is the Faculty Senate Chairperson telling faculty that the Senior Vice President no longer oversees the Quad Cities campus? He has said this to people in Macomb and the Quad Cities"

Answer by Chair Pynes: I have stated that Rives's title has changed several times recently, and is currently: Senior Vice President for Strategic Planning and Initiatives, but I haven't commented on who runs the QC campus. Given that it is an academic institution that is part of WIU, I assumed WIU President, Jack Thomas and the current provost were in charge of that campus. But to be honest, I have never fully understood the nature of the decision-making processes that govern the QC campus.

5. "Are people aware how damaging a public debate like this is to enrollment and retention?"

Answer by ExCo: 12 consecutive years of down enrollment for a total of a 44% decline from fall 2006 to fall 2018! We believe that not having this conversation about how the university IS being run and how it OUGHT to be run is part of the problem. We can't fix the things if we don't know they are broken. We are trying to bring clarity to the budget situation and the relationship with the campuses.

6. "Why are people in Macomb wanting to close where I go to school?"

Answer by ExCo: We don't, and we would like to know who is responsible for spreading this rumor. But the same question was asked in Macomb by students who had programs eliminated in Philosophy, Religious Studies, Women's Studies, and African American Studies back in 2016, and the same is being asked by students in Anthropology, Art, and Physics, and the other APER programs today.

7 "I thought Institutional Research was supposed to be neutral when providing data? How can we trust that office, now and or in the future?"

Answer by ExCo: IPR was neutral in providing data. The questioner misunderstands what IPR does and how its research relates to our report.

8. "Why would the Institutional Research person say they would do admissions analysis since we only have an interim admissions director. Does she know how long that person has worked at WIU? Why was such a derogatory remark made about this employee and was this comment not ruled a personal attack?"

Answer by ExCo: This question seems to miss the mark. The analysis was about how effective the fliers WIU sends to certain ACT ranges are. Senator Tasdan who asked the question of IRP is a professional statistician, and from the way he was

asking the question wanted to see if we could save money and better target certain areas with a statistical analysis.

9. "Why are a couple of people using the Faculty Senate floor for personal agendas?"

Answer by ExCo: We don't understand this question. ExCo produced the report for the benefit of WIU. To the extent that the University's future is at risk, the issues in the report should be in everyone's personal and professional agenda.

10. "Why did the Faculty Senate Chair acknowledge that the data were only a first attempt at analysis--and then make a flippant remark that the Quad Cities causes a 123% of the deficit? Who validated the analysis?"

Answer by Chair Pynes: My remark wasn't flippant. It was serious. The short-term analysis speaks for itself. I hope that future analysis clarify the long-term trends and financial relationship between the two campuses and extension offerings.

11. "Programs not campuses fall under APER,"

Answer by ExCo: This isn't a questions, and we are aware that programs fall under APER and not campuses. The point was conditional. **IF** the QC campus were a program, then it would be on the APER evaluation list. The point is to show the magnitude of how much that campus costs and the return on that investment. Given that the SCH production on the QC campus has shrunk considerably in the last few years, below two university departments, this should be a serious concern.

12. "I know that administration and faculty not always see eye to eye, but this is ridiculous and an embarrassment."

Answer: by ExCo: This isn't a question either. But we agree that if the administration didn't realize how much the QC campus really costs, then it is both ridiculous and embarrassing.

13, "Why was the Vice President who can explain the budgeting process left to stand at the microphone for 20 minutes and not allowed to talk?"

Answer by Chair Pynes: I pointed to Bill Polley twice and he shook his head and backed away. Senators always have the right to the floor first and guest second. The VP in question decided to stand and not talk. He wasn't prevented from talking.

14. "Aren't we one university with two campuses?"

Answer by ExCo: Yes. Understanding how much each campus produces in income and how much they cost is the main point of the report.

15. "How do the other Trustees feel about this unprofessional attack?"

Answer by ExCo: You need to ask the other trustees. We suggest you ask if they fully understand the budgets they have been passing, and if they knew how well the two campuses were performing when they eliminated programs and authorized the layoffs of tenured faculty on two separate occasions. Please get back to us when they answer you.

16. "Are you (asked to me) worried that this hurts our accreditation efforts?"

Answer by ExCo: The Senior Vice President for Strategic Planning and Initiatives should answer this question. ExCo doesn't believe so if the "it" refers to our report itself. Attempting to use accreditation as a shield against administrative criticism is not leadership. If, however, the content of the report is what is being referred to as "it," then we hope that the questioner is not implying that that the data should be concealed to satisfy some accreditation. This would be ethically suspect and even professionally negligent likely violating ethics reporting standards. We await the Senior VPs response.

17. "How can you say the analysis is based on university revenue and then say oh you would have to get that information from the Foundation. It is not included."

Answer by ExCo: This was a question to the budget director and not to us. We suggest you ask the budget office. Perhaps the Budget Director's answer didn't get transmitted to the QC. The minutes should reflect the answer when they are completed.

18. "Why was it not made clear the QCML monies, like any other new recurring monies are put in the University budget and roll forward year to year. The Faculty Senate Chairperson led people in the room that money was only received one time. He did not represent the facts."

Answer by ExCo: ExCo believes this question is best answered by the budget director.

19. "Why did the Faculty Senate Chairperson use the term Macomb has to absorb the Quad Cities costs? Aren't we one University?"

Answer by Chair Pynes: Yes we are one university. But if the QC campus doesn't generate enough SCH, then they lose money. Those costs have to be made up in

some manner and place. Macomb is where cuts to programs and services occur in order to make up deficits in the QC (and Macomb).

20. "Why did the Faculty Senate Chairperson seem to apply that the Quad Cities campus had no facilities workers when we came to Riverfront Hall? Did he think we had no janitorial services in the Quad Cities?" And did he ever stop to think to compare facilities costs against QCML School of Engineering revenue? One clearly outweighs the other."

Answer by Chair Pynes: I honestly don't understand this series of questions.

21. "I heard there was a second document sent to the Faculty Senate by the Chairperson that tried to set context for this was not campuses against one another. If this is true, why did he not share that in his summary?"

Answer by Chair Pynes: I sent out an email to Senators with some minor corrections and some context the day before. Because it is a Faculty Senate discussion I didn't feel the need to send it to others. Additionally, I had a 102.5-degree fever an hour before the Senate meeting on the 14th. I was clearly not at my best when summarizing. I will work to do a better job next time when I am feeling better.

22. "Is this what the Faculty Chairperson had in mind when he came to Faculty Council and talked about working together. By the way, his views of our campus were really off the day he came. He had no idea of the size of our faculty."

Answer by Chair Pynes: Yes, this is what I have in mind. The QC is not getting the funding it needs from the state. WIU had a new campus built, but we didn't get the additional dollars to support and build the QC campus up the way it should be. As chair of the WIU Faculty Senate, I want both campuses to flourish and be the best they can be. That requires that we understand the income and cost of each campus. As for my understanding of the QC campus. I not only know how many faculty you have, I know the FTE number for your faculty, staff, and administrators. Table 45 of the fact book on page 95. Have a look for all kinds of interesting facts and data: http://www.wiu.edu/IRP/Fact%20Book%202018_Full.pdf



Hamm, Annette <ae-hamm@wiu.edu>

Re: WIU Income/Expenditure Report and Presentation

1 message

Pynes, Christopher <ca-pynes@wiu.edu>

Mon, Feb 18, 2019 at 8:23 AM

To: "Porter, Rob" <r-porter@wiu.edu>

Cc: Joseph Rives <j-rives@wiu.edu>, Jack Thomas <j-thomas2@wiu.edu>, Carolyn Ehler Fuller <ehlerfuller@gmail.com>, "Yvonne S. Savala" <Yvonne.S.Savala@imegcorp.com>, Roger Clawson <rd-clawson@wiu.edu>, Todd Lester <tv-lester@wiu.edu>, Justin Brown <ja-brown12@wiu.edu>, Jesse Ramos <j-ramos2@wiu.edu>, Grant Reed <g-reed2@wiu.edu>, Annette E Hamm <AE-Hamm@wiu.edu>

Bcc: AE-Hamm@wiu.edu

Dear Professor Porter,

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has written a reply to your email of 14 February 2014. It is attached as a PDF. I am including all those who you cc-ed, and I am blind copying all the Faculty Senators. Why do I send emails to Senators with bcc? Because our discussions should be done on the floor and I don't want to encourage long email chains. The reply should be to me or bring the discussion to the senate floor where it belongs.

Additionally ExCo deems this correspondence of Faculty Senate business worthy of being appended to the minutes of its meeting of February 14, 2019. So your email and the ExCo reply will be part of the formal record.

If you desire to continue the discussion, then I invite you to our Senate meeting on Tuesday, 19 February 2019.

On Behalf of ExCo,
Christopher

Christopher Pynes, Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy &
Chair, Faculty Senate
Department of Mathematics & Philosophy
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455-1390

Phone: 309.298.1467

Do You Philosophize!?!?

On Fri, Feb 15, 2019 at 1:47 PM Porter, Rob <r-porter@wiu.edu> wrote:

Dr. Pynes:

As Quad Cities Faculty Council Chair, it is with great dismay that I write this email. Your presentation, deceptively titled WIU Income/Expenditure Comparison, at yesterday's Faculty Senate was rife with bias and clearly an attempt at undermining the Quad Cities Campus.

The most egregious issue here is that you did not involve Quad Cities Senators, administrators, or me in the creation of this report. This can only be viewed as an attempt on your part to maintain secrecy and distance from Quad Cities representatives so that you could advance your agenda unimpeded.

If the information in the report were to get out publicly, it could seriously affect the enrollment health of the *entire* institution. We have seen this damage incurred before. For this reason, I am not sure why you would decide to disseminate it without first consulting with representatives from the Quad Cities, myself and the Senior Vice President at least, and the University President.

On that note, many faculty have expressed concern that you and other members of the Senate have stated that Dr. Rives does not have oversight of the Quad Cities Campus. As you may have gleaned from a brief reading of his page on the university website, "The Senior Vice President for Strategic Planning and Initiatives oversees the Western Illinois University-Quad Cities Campus." While Dr. Rives has undergone a title change, your assertions are untrue, inappropriate, and inaccurate leading to false conclusions on your part. For this reason, he should have been brought into the conversation early on, possibly to clarify some of the misinformation you present in your report.

18 February 2018

Dear Professor Porter,

Thank you for your email. You have what I take to be six major concerns:

- (1) Faculty Senate is biased and wants to undermine the QC.
- (2) ExCo didn't involve QC Senators or administrator in our report
- (3) If our report were to be made public, it would harm WIU.
- (4) Joe Rives is the QC leader.
- (5) You should have gotten a copy, and ExCo should have been more transparent.
- (6) Rebukes of both me as chair that I represent all faculty and my comment about the QC being at the top of the list for elimination.

Let me begin with some clarification. Faculty Senate was formed and granted authority by the Board of Trustees. We have an established constitution you can find at the following link: http://wiu.edu/faculty_senate/constitution/index.php

The Purpose States: "The Faculty Senate shall serve as a means by which the opinions and viewpoints of the faculty may be determined and communicated to the administration of the University, and it shall serve as an agency through which the faculty may participate in the formation of basic University policy. To accomplish these goals, the Faculty Senate shall: ...

With special attention to numbers 10 and 11:

10. Determine policies which will provide for faculty participation in the preparation of the budgets of the University.
11. Participate in discussion and make recommendations on any subject which affects the welfare of the University.

Faculty Senate is the body that represents ALL FACULTY as a part of shared governance. Faculty Senate and its ExCo do not report to any faculty councils – whether it's the QC faculty council or the College of Arts and Sciences faculty council. Faculty Senate has the authority to do what we have done; it's based in our constitution.

To be irritated that you were not consulted is somewhat understandable, but realize that this isn't just about the QC, but is a budget analysis of WIU, both campuses. Also, we don't share things with people or other bodies before we want them to have them. We discuss things that are our purview. You may think that is biased and an attempt to undermine the QC or some other group, but you would be wrong. We are seeking clarity in the budget to properly support both campuses in the most appropriate way. This is our reply to concern (1). As for (2). QC Senators got the report and are able to participate in the Senate discussion just like every other Senator. Realize that the report is about the entire campus, not just the QC.

Concern (3). We have declined three media requests for our report. Why? We want to have the discussion internally first. They can come and listen to our discussion, but ExCo is not going to make this report available to the media unless it is forced to. Why? Well, we actually think that all the information SHOULD be public. WIU is a publicly funded institution. The public has a right to know how their money is being managed. The reporters, on the other hand, they should have been doing this work a long time ago. But to your concern: will it hurt enrollment if all this budget info gets out?

Think of it this way: 12 consecutive years of down enrollment for a total of a 44% decline from fall 2006 to fall 2018! We believe that not having this conversation about how the university IS being run and how it OUGHT to be run is part of the problem. We can't fix the things we don't know are broken. Eliminating programs and laying off faculty without a clear budget picture is a real problem. We are trying to bring clarity to the budget situation and the relationship with the campuses so that everyone knows where they stand.

(4) Joe Rives is a Senior VP at WIU in charge of the QC. No one on ExCo has stated otherwise. The answer Chair Pynes gave in replying to a similar question from Rives is this: "I have stated that Rives's title has changed several times recently, and is currently: Senior Vice President for Strategic Planning and Initiatives, but I haven't commented on who runs the QC campus. Given that WIU-QC is an academic institution that is part of WIU, I assumed WIU President, Jack Thomas and the current provost were in charge of that campus. But to be honest, I have never fully understood the nature of the decision-making processes that govern the QC campus."

(5) You as the chair of the QC faculty council aren't entitled to see the work of Faculty Senate before Senators or anyone else. ExCo would say this to any of the chairs of any of the faculty councils or any group that reports to Senate. In fact, ExCo didn't share this report with the Budget Transparency Committee ahead of time. They got it when all the Senators did. It was, however, shared with the Provost, who was given a preliminary copy, on January 29th.

ExCo demands transparency of administrators because they are in charge of the budget and layoffs and other university related decisions. They have the fiduciary responsibility for running the institution. ExCo is transparent with the body it leads and the faculty it represents. We gave the report to the Senators for their review. We also gave it to the people who attended the meeting on December 20th as well as the President and the Provost of WIU. That's more than transparent in our view.

(6) Finally, you rebuke the Chair of Faculty Senate for not representing the entire faculty and that Chairperson Pynes attacked the QC faculty. Nothing could be further from the truth. The comment about the QC being on the top of the list was a comparative, conditional statement. **IF** the QC campus were a program, then it would be failing and at the top of the APER list. The point is to show the magnitude of how much that campus costs and the return on that investment. Given that the SCH production on the QC campus has shrunk considerably in the last few years, below two university departments, this should be a serious concern for everyone.

What ExCo wants is for the state to start supporting the QC in the right way while at the same time supporting WIU Macomb. If the WIU administration doesn't know what the QC is costing, then they can't actually properly ask for the right kind of budget increases to support it. ***ExCo wants the WIU administration and BOT to be fully informed when asking for state funding as well as when they make decisions about the elimination of programs, departments, and faculty. To this point, we haven't seen evidence that this kind of informed decision making has been happening.***

ExCo's Concerns to those who object to the report:

ExCo is a bit dismayed that you and your QC colleagues aren't more concerned about the substance of the report rather than Joe Rives's titles and who's the boss in the QC. Right now, all the bosses are failing the students, staff, and faculty of WIU.

We think the announcement that WIU requires 5 million in expenditure cuts threatens enrollment more. We assume you have been just as alarmed with that along with the plan for further cuts next year and layoffs coming in March. ExCo has witnessed the impacts of two rounds of layoffs and program eliminations over the past few years. Hiding our budget data to protect the institution is the types of argument Enron made before going bankrupt. Such arguments guarantee our demise. We have to be open and honest about what we have, what we value, and how we spend out money on those values.

Finally, ExCo stands by its analysis, and we hope that the BOT budget committee, the Senate's BTC, and the rest of the campus can get a better understanding our current budget context.

Sincerely and on Behalf of the Executive Committee,
Christopher Pynes
Chair, Faculty Senate