

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 19 September 2023
4:00 p.m. – Via Zoom

ACTION MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Julia Albarracin, Chair; Everett Hamner, Vice Chair; Denise Gravitt, Secretary
ALSO PRESENT: Mark Mossman, Associate Provost; Jeremy Robinett, Parliamentarian; Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Office Manager
GUESTS: Troy Rhoades, Director, Facilities Management; Rich Filipink, Chair, CAGAS; Sarah Lawson, Registrar

1. *Council on Campus Planning and Usage Discussion – Troy Rhoades, Director, Facilities Management*

At the request of the Executive Committee, Mr. Rhoades, who serves ex-officio on the Council on Campus Planning and Usage (CCPU), spoke about what he sees as the value and purpose of the council. He noted that CCPU helps faculty to understand and have the opportunity to provide input into some of the administration's actions and activities in regard to Facilities Management. He believes the Facilities Management Director's role is to be a conduit to provide CCPU a window onto the campus master plan and where the university stands with that. Mr. Rhoades related that some good dialogue comes back from the council, and questions they ask are answered by him. He stressed that Faculty Senate and its council, though, need to be cognizant when requesting information and reports from Facilities Management that over the past five years their resources have become very limited; their staff have been stretched extremely thin and have to wear a lot of hats.

Mr. Rhoades related that CCPU went through an extensive deliberation regarding building and space reduction on the Macomb campus and ultimately concluded that Tillman was the proper building to take offline. He recalled that CCPU discussed this over at least four to six meetings involving quite a bit of work gathering information on maintenance, materials, labor usage, utility expenditures, and more that was reported to CCPU. Mr. Rhoades thought it was interesting, however, that this information did not seem to get widely shared with faculty; although there was consensus from the council, this information was not disseminated down to the faculty at-large. Mr. Rhoades related that some faculty seemed to view taking Tillman offline as a decline of the institution, but he thinks the message should be that of an institution being effective and efficient with its resources; rather than indicating that WIU is in decline, this indicates that those involved in the decision, including CCPU, are being realistic about the university's status and using resources as effectively as possible. Mr. Rhoades thinks this is a prime example of how CCPU could be of assistance to Facilities Management in efforts to propel the institution forward.

Mr. Rhoades noted that CCPU has some authority and question/answer capabilities; however, they do not have the authority to dictate policy. CCPU can, though, make recommendations that can be coordinated with the administration on how and what kinds of things need to happen realistically. He thinks the value of CCPU lies in being a conduit to get and share information so that everyone is pulling together in the same direction for what is best for WIU. CCPU can definitely provide feedback on faculty needs, but Mr. Rhoades thinks the focus to and from the committee and ExCo should be data driven and that discussions should lead to logical, reasonable decisions based upon a consensus around which everyone can pull together.

Senator Gravitt remarked this is what she expected CCPU to be, but that is not what occurred when she served on it recently. She asked what kind of support Facilities Management needs from the faculty and how CCPU could help move Facilities Management's agenda forward. She suggested this might involve trying to help research solar panels or prioritizing which sidewalk repairs need to be completed first. Mr. Rhoades replied it is not difficult for Facilities Management to get that kind of information on its own. He would like for CCPU to provide, for example, information about what they would like to see in their classrooms that could help them do their jobs better. He would like to know what faculty anticipate their needs being in ten years with more technologically advanced classrooms. Another example would be ideas on how flex space could be used more or

what kinds of things could be expanded to help faculty reach their students easier and improve student learning. Senator Gravitt remarked it might be worthwhile to survey faculty in each building on this question.

Mr. Rhoades would also like for CCPU to be more of a conduit back to other faculty; if Mr. Rhoades shares a report with CCPU, he would like for it to be more widely disseminated. He reiterated that CCPU worked through the reduction plan with Mr. Rhoades and identified a space to be taken offline, but when Facilities Management rolled out the suggestion to take Tillman down there was a lot of pushback and claims that no one had talked to faculty about this plan. He thinks this type of discussion should come back from CCPU to the Executive Committee, who should push it out to the rest of the faculty. He would have liked for more faculty to realize that this was discussed with faculty representatives and that there was good data and logic behind the decision. Senator Gravitt wonders if there was a time lag between the time taking Tillman offline was discussed and when it actually occurred. She added that faculty priorities post-COVID may also have gotten in the way of promoting this decision more widely.

Senator Hamner remarked that it sounds like not only is faculty involvement needed in the planning and decision making but also in the amplification of why decisions are made so that Mr. Rhoades is not left holding the proverbial bag. He asked if there is a faculty representative in every building on campus who could network with others in case there is a problem. Mr. Rhoades replied this might be a good thing, but currently there are building representatives through whom Facilities Management communicates and to whom individuals in the buildings can take concerns. For instance, if water needs to be turned off in a building, Facilities Management will send an email to everyone with occupancy in that building, but they will communicate more in depth with the building rep, who might convey information back about critical functions going on during that time or a special event that has already been scheduled. A list of building representatives can be found at https://www.wiu.edu/facilities_management/represent.php.

Senator Hamner remarked that CCPU might be a council where biweekly or meetings on a regular basis may not be needed but if something special comes up it may need to hold four or five meetings in a five-week period. Mr. Rhoades said that might be possible, or CCPU might be able to create a small subgroup that could help with a certain project. He said CCPU might be able to act as a communication piece when certain projects that Facilities Management has to do are very intrusive to faculty and council members could be asked to bring back feedback. He noted that the chilled water project that occurred on the south campus this past summer was extremely disruptive with a lot of construction, but no matter when projects are completed there will always be someone occupying the affected space, and it would be helpful to have feedback which might inform Facilities Management that a project does not just affect one department but another one as well, for example.

Senator Gravitt asked if there are any buildings where Facilities Management might need input or a plan to be in place prior to it being needed, such as using residence halls to quarantine students during COVID. Mr. Rhoades responded that residence halls fall under the jurisdiction and oversight of University Housing and Dining. He said they have a master plan but are resource strapped, so their plan is challenged at best. He said once that master plan can be refreshed, faculty feedback will be key. Mr. Rhoades thinks CCPU could also help with a facility usage survey which is desperately needed. He said a facility condition assessment and space utilization study needs to be developed to be incorporated into the facilities master plan, and the space utilization study would be a good piece for CCPU to help with; the Registrar's office will also be an asset for this study once Facilities Management gets funding to conduct it. Mr. Rhoades thinks this would be a good place to start moving in a better direction for WIU to more efficiently and effectively use its available space.

Senator Hamner expressed his thanks to Mr. Rhoades, adding it would be easy to feel that the kind of work done by Facilities Management does not always get recognized. He hopes there can be a good partnership with Facilities Management across campuses and across faculty and staff lines. Mr. Rhoades said he stands on the shoulders of a lot of hardworking people who do yeoman's work on a daily basis.

Following the ExCo meeting, Mr. Rhoades asked that the following narrative be included in the minutes: I see this council's role being valuable in communication of facility-related information to faculty. This could be accomplished in no more than one meeting per semester. I also see a very strong value in this council being the liaison when we begin a campus facility master plan update. The number of necessary meetings involved in a

master plan update would be considerably more than one per semester, but those increased meetings could be scheduled upon commencement of a facility master plan update.

2. Charge to CAGAS from May 2023 – Rich Filipink, Chair, CAGAS

Chair Albarracin recalled that Trustee Polly Radosh asked the Executive Committee to call a special meeting on May 16, 2023, in order to express her concerns about WIU's enrollment and to request the committee to gather some information. She related that Trustee Radosh's main concern was the university accepting students with lower GPAs, and she asked for a cost-benefit analysis of what it costs WIU to accept these students who do not end up staying since retention is related to lower GPAs. In late spring, former Senate Chair Bill Thompson put together a charge for CAGAS based on the concerns and requests from Trustee Radosh, but Chair Albarracin saw problems with it and submitted an alternate charge, focused on questions regarding retention by GPA, which was accepted by the Executive Committee to send to CAGAS. Chair Albarracin noted that if the university's standards are going to be raised, it is important to think about the students that will most impact, which is students of color. She stated that since there are new Executive Committee members and a new CAGAS Chair, a decision needs to be made whether to confirm the charge, revise it, or drop it entirely.

Dr. Filipink told ExCo members that when the charge was presented to CAGAS during summer session, he moved to table it, and CAGAS unanimously supported that because they did not have much guidance about the 12-part charge. Dr. Filipink is unsure that the items in part (b) of the charge, which focus on retention initiatives, are necessary to study at this point since the former Vice President for Enrollment Management is no longer at WIU and half of the points in this section refer to retention initiatives under her management. He noted that retention initiatives are in the process of being retooled based on the elimination of this vice presidency, and until new ones are in place and implemented there seems no need for raking over past initiatives.

Dr. Filipink noted that (a)4, which asks for the reasons students drop out, is something that Justin Schuch has tried to do, but most students do not answer or say they do not have the money, and CAGAS is not in a position to exit survey students. Regarding (a)6, differences in retention rates across departments, Dr. Filipink stated that the Provost's office collects this information and would be a better source than CAGAS. Dr. Filipink does not know what purpose (a)7, providing information on the number of Fs in major General Education classes, serves, nor is he comfortable with this because it begins to impinge on the academic freedom of professors to assess the students in their courses. Dr. Filipink thinks providing dropout rates for students in major Gen Ed courses might be helpful, but the charge is unclear as to whether this refers to students leaving the university entirely or just dropping out of specific courses.

Dr. Filipink thinks that the first three charges are ones that CAGAS could reasonably provide, but noted that it seems the Board of Trustees could obtain the data more easily than going through CAGAS. He noted that (b)12, the effectiveness of early warning grades as a tool for retention, is relevant to CAGAS, but since the time that early warning grades go out was just moved up, it would seem more beneficial to delay this charge for a couple of years by which time there would be data on the new system and whether it affects retention more than the previous early warning system.

Parliamentarian Robinett remarked that (a)7 and (a)8, which ask about Fs and dropout rates in Gen Ed classes, are topics that have been raised in the past; former Provost and Interim President Abraham had a tiger team looking into this, and Enrollment Management wanted to see whether students regularly fail certain Gen Ed courses. Parliamentarian Robinett served on this tiger team and pointed out that WIU's fail rates were not very different than the national statistics. He said that at that time the question was raised whether the university was experiencing cohort effect in classes that students are heavily enrolled in because a lot of the courses in which students were failing were ones that freshmen typically take their first semester. Chair Albarracin said this was something she studied when writing a grant; in every institution, there are certain lower-level introductory courses that seem to act as filters in which many students fail and many leave the university after taking those classes. Chair Albarracin added this question to the charge not to point fingers but because she thinks as an institution WIU needs to identify those courses in order to provide the necessary support that students who are taking them might need to succeed. Dr. Filipink stated that although the intention is not to point fingers at professors teaching these courses, that is how the data might be used. Chair Albarracin asked if this is public

information that could be provided by the Registrar. Registrar Sarah Lawson replied that the information is not in the fact book but would not be information that is protected by FERPA as long as it is not tied directly to students.

Senator Gravitt remarked that moving the early warning timeline up may be great for freshmen but does not help her sophomore, junior, and senior students since their first exam typically occurs too late for the new early warning timeline. She wishes that instead of a blanket, across-the-board timeline there could be an alternate timeline for freshmen who need early intervention but not necessarily that soon for all levels of students. Dr. Filipink replied that is one of the reasons why he does not want CAGAS do conduct a study of the early warning system's effectiveness until there is more data available. He noted that the initial proposal from the administration was to move the timeline up to the fourth week, but CAGAS moved it back. He thinks, however, that it would be nearly impossible to parse out the early warning system among classes, with the exception of FYE and some 400-level courses, because, unless there are hard prerequisites, students can take courses whenever they wish. He noted that it is difficult to get some faculty to turn in early warning grades at all, and it would be nearly impossible to get them to do it multiple times during the semester; logically this might make sense, but practically it would not work.

Chair Albarracin said she would not object to dropping the entire charge. Dr. Filipink responded that (a)1-3 are things CAGAS should be tracking and the basis for an actual retention plan. These include (a)1, persistence rates broken down by GPA semester; (a)2, GPA of admitted students by race; (a)3, persistence rates broken down by gender. Dr. Filipink noted that since WIU does not use standardized testing any more for admissions, if GPA is to be used as a measure of student success then seeing how the rate breaks down by race and gender as regards persistence rates makes sense and is probably something that should be tracked. He thinks this kind of report would benefit Student Services and Academic Affairs when making retention plans going forward. Dr. Filipink also thinks looking at (b)12, early warning effectiveness, would make sense in a couple of years, but the other items would not really achieve what this charge aims to achieve.

Senator Gravitt asked if students are required to report their race, to which Registrar Lawson responded it is not mandatory on the application. Parliamentarian Robinett stated that the University Retention Committee has access to this history; data on minority retention for Fall 2017, 2018, and 2019 was used to determine that there is a problem at WIU with retention of black males. He added that these data exist through IPEDS, and Mr. Schuch would be able to pull together what has been shared. Dr. Filipink added that gender information should also be attainable in the same fashion. He reiterated that he is not advocating for eliminating the charge but for limiting it to something more actionable that makes more sense. Chair Albarracin said she would also like for (a)4 to be considered by CAGAS in addition to the first three items because she would like to see information on the reasons students leave the university. Registrar Lawson noted that the data already exists; when students complete a withdrawal form, there is space for comments, and this information is collected by the Office of Retention Initiatives. Dr. Filipink stated that in this case CAGAS could gather this information as well.

The Executive Committee voted unanimously to revise the charge to CAGAS to the first four items on the previous document and extend the deadline date to November 14.

3. *Discussion of attendance policies*

Chair Albarracin informed ExCo that the Provost is very interested in establishing an attendance policy that would make attendance mandatory in order to encourage more struggling students to attend classes. Chair Albarracin is a believer in having an attendance policy that would encourage students to attend; she usually accomplishes this through in-class assignments where if her students miss a Thursday class, they miss a lot of points as well as material that will be on their test. She uses this approach to keep a close eye on students in her First-Year Experience class to make sure they are attending and not falling through the cracks.

Parliamentarian Robinett asked if a recommendation for an attendance policy change would come from CAGAS or from Faculty Senate. Ms. Hamm responded that the university's current Policy on Grades and Class Attendance was generated by CAGAS, so a change to that policy would have to go through CAGAS for approval, then to Faculty Senate to approval, and finally to the President.

Chair Albarracin remarked that the current policy is simply that all faculty must have an attendance policy. Dr. Filipink observed that each faculty member determines their own attendance policy; in conjunction with academic freedom, faculty determine how the grades are reached in their courses. Senator Gravitt asked if data could be gathered for how student success rates align with classes with mandatory attendance policies because any decision on an attendance policy should be data driven. Chair Albarracin noted there is a lot of research that a recommendation could be based on; she volunteered to collect information on attendance and its affect on retention because social scientists around the world are collecting this data.

Dr. Filipink reiterated that from his perspective as CAGAS Chair and UPI Grievance Officer, the attendance policy for a class is determined by the faculty member who teaches the class; this is part of a faculty member's system for determining their grades and is outside the purview of university policy. He stated that faculty have the right to set their grading policies based on the performance of students in their classes, and whether attendance is included in that is up to the faculty member.

Senator Gravitt asked if all universities hold this as part of academic freedom; Dr. Filipink replied affirmatively, except in some rare instances. Parliamentarian Robinett remarked that years ago he asked UPI to give him a definition of academic freedom, and he was given a statement on academic freedom and tenure from 1940, but he did not see anything about attendance in that statement. He asked where WIU's definition of academic freedom comes from. Dr. Filipink replied that part of it comes from the collective bargaining agreement; a graded activity depends on what faculty members put in their syllabi. He noted that incentivizing attendance by giving students points, for instance, depends on the faculty member when determining the grading scale. Dr. Filipink admitted that his policy is to not take attendance; if students do not attend class, they will flunk his exams, while students who persist and attend class will do well, which tends to sort students out pretty quickly. He added this tends to keep his classes quite full throughout the semester. Parliamentarian Robinett observed that Dr. Filipink primarily teaches upper division courses, but Dr. Filipink said that most semesters he also teaches HIST 106 and uses the same policy.

Chair Albarracin would like for the Executive Committee to continue this topic and consider conducting a survey of faculty and having a university-wide conversation. She noted that faculty are concerned about enrollment numbers and retention and would like to see a wider conversation about best practices and strategies to help students succeed.

Dr. Filipink pointed out that one part of the existing policy is a statement that students are expected to attend all classes in which they enroll. He is not convinced that changing "expected" to "required" in the policy will result in students showing up in any greater percentage than currently. Provost Zoghi asked if Dr. Filipink actually includes this in his syllabi. Dr. Filipink replied that when he goes over the syllabus with students during the first week of class, he tells them "You will notice that there is no attendance policy in my syllabus. That is because you will fail my class if you don't show up. It would be in your best interest to show up for class if you want to pass the course."

Provost Zoghi noted that syllabi are now required to include a statement about military service. He asked whether it would be possible to add a statement, not to make attendance mandatory, but to inform that students who attend classes are more successful, and if they do not attend it will jeopardize their retention. Dr. Filipink suggested that if there is the desire to add to the syllabus policy, it would be sufficient to add the first two sentences of the existing absence policy: "Students are expected to attend all classes in which they enroll. Each faculty member determines his or her policy dealing with class attendance." He said this will set the faculty member up to remember to enumerate their policy; Provost Zoghi thinks this might be a good idea because in this way faculty members would be reminded to communicate their policy to their students. Parliamentarian Robinett remarked that this is already in the Course Syllabus Policy as #8: instructors are required to "provide attendance requirements and penalties" in their syllabi.

Senator Gravitt remarked she has always had an attendance policy with two excused absences per semester, but she knows many faculty who have no attendance policy. Dr. Filipink stated that students must be told that faculty do not have a punishable attendance policy if that is the case. Since Dr. Filipink's courses are live streamed, he

does give his students the opportunity to watch the recording of his classes if they ask. Senator Hamner said all of his courses are live streamed, also, and he posts recordings of every class so that if students miss, they can watch them without asking. Senator Hamner similarly emphasizes during Week 1 and repeatedly throughout the semester that student attendance is absolutely crucial to learning, not just individually but also communally. He has known QC faculty that have attempted absolute attendance policies, literally locking the door the minute class starts, but it has not been successful with the largely off-campus community-oriented students who attend the WIU Quad Cities campus. Senator Hamner said his approach is more one-to-one; when a student does not attend his class, he reaches out to the student via email to ask why the student missed and how Senator Hamner can help. Dr. Filipink remarked that live streaming classes makes it a lot easier to tell who is absent as opposed to 45 students in a classroom where it may be difficult to tell who is not present for the first couple of weeks; if students do not attend via zoom, there can be a much quicker turnaround to reach out to them.

Registrar Lawson remarked that the first couple of weeks are crucial; part of the goal of an attendance policy is to determine who is attending class for the first ten days with more certainty, partly for regulatory reasons and also so that something can be done to help students to either stay in or drop the class. Dr. Filipink thinks this has been why there has been no pushback from faculty to providing Financial Aid with this information. Registrar Lawson responded that the return rate from faculty is horribly low; Dr. Filipink attributes this partly to the fact that this is a new policy. He thinks persisting in explaining why this information is so important and necessary will help improve the response rate. He noted that when it was explained to faculty how important early warning grades are to retention, the response rate increased from 50-60 percent to 75-80 percent.

Senator Gravitt asked Provost Zoghi why reporting attendance is not part of faculty's job description since it must be completed for financial aid reasons. Provost Zoghi responded he thinks it will be helpful to make faculty more aware of the importance of attendance so that more of them buy into it voluntarily. He stressed that requiring attendance for just the first couple of semesters can make a big difference because students then develop that habit. He thinks faculty need to realize that learning does not just take place in the context of courses but that students are also learning the discipline of showing up on time, which can carry over to future jobs. Provost Zoghi thinks this needs to be communicated to the faculty in general, which is one of the reasons that the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (CITR) is being restructured in order to have more interaction with faculty, in addition to professional development opportunities and training.

Senator Hamner thinks the university needs to consider its admissions standards and whether students have sufficient backgrounds to succeed at WIU. He supports the importance of students meeting with faculty regularly and interacting with each other; it is just a question of methodology. In his experience, it is far more effective to express care, concern, and openness to students than to use the stick method with automatic penalties. He is not questioning the value of students attending in-person, but this can differ according to context and discipline.

Senator Gravitt suggested that, given the concerns regarding academic freedom, it might be best to have a conversation on best practices through CITR. Provost Zoghi remarked there are ample opportunities to communicate to faculty, starting at faculty orientation, the evidence that students who participate in classes are more likely to be more successful and retain. Dr. Filipink does not think the issue is faculty not wanting students to come to class; rather, the issue is students not coming to class. Based on anecdotal and his own experiences, he does not think using the stick to make students come to class will be any more successful than what is already being done. He also does not think faculty need to be educated on the importance of having students come to class; it is the student's responsibility to come to class, which is why the policy is worded as it is. Provost Zoghi thinks part of the challenge is that more than half of WIU students are first generation college students who are not as prepped. Dr. Filipink said he understands this reality but thinks this speaks to the importance of providing greater support, such as through increasing the number of academic support personnel (ASP) and the actions of Student Services to help transition students to a university environment. He noted that traditional students come out of high schools with scheduled classes which students are expected to attend, so he does not think the problem is that students do not know what college is like but rather that the transition to college is the first time that students have lived away from home and are expected to make their own decisions, which are sometimes poor ones. He does not think that having a mandatory attendance policy will bring these students into his classroom every day.

Parliamentarian Robinett related that he allows students three excused absences for any reason. He said that while everyone has anecdotal evidence about attendance in their classrooms, he wonders if there is any data from WIU that shows that students understand the importance of attendance as part of their success – not faculty’s interpretation but that of the students. He thinks it might be interesting to ask students how they understand attendance and to see whether they understand it in a different way. He asked if CAGAS is the body that would collect data like this. Dr. Filipink replied that CAGAS normally gets a charge from ExCo to help determine a policy but the council is not equipped to survey students to collect data. Registrar Lawson added that her office can look at the grades that students are getting but would not have information about whether faculty have an attendance policy for those classes. Dr. Filipink suggested that polling students about attendance may fall more under the Student Services division. He noted that over the past few years the emphasis was to get faculty to give students as much leeway as possible during the pandemic, such as livestreams. He thinks collecting data about students’ understanding of attendance may be valuable. Parliamentarian Robinett volunteered to speak to Mr. Schuch to see if such a survey of students is possible, perhaps delivered through Rockybot.

Dr. Filipink remarked that since CAGAS, in the revised charge, will be looking at student persistence from first to second semester and from first year to second year, a survey of attendance for FYE courses might be a place to start, at least from a faculty perspective. Parliamentarian Robinett questioned whether students approach their FYE courses with the same level of seriousness as their other courses. Dr. Filipink replied this is his point, particularly since for the past 16 years faculty have been told that small FYE courses help with student retention. He said if students have the attitude Parliamentarian Robinett suspects, maybe it is time to go down a different road since the purpose of these courses has been to ease the transition from high school to college and help with student persistence. He thinks if students do not take these courses seriously, it might indicate a real problem and the university may wish to consider them in a different way. Chair Albarracin expressed her strong support for FYE classes since the small class sizes allow faculty to do a lot of things with their students, such as group assignments that help them get to know one another, and helps the transition to college. Parliamentarian Robinett said he should have specified UNIV 100 rather than the Y course of the First-Year Experience program. Chair Albarracin asked which students must take UNIV 100; Dr. Filipink replied that it is taken by freshmen in the Reach program. Registrar Lawson added that these students are strongly encouraged to take UNIV 100 but no one is forced to take it.

Chair Albarracin volunteered to look for data on first generation students and students of color versus other students as regards attendance and students’ understanding of its importance. She would like to see some data about students’ understanding before continuing the attendance discussion. She also wonders if all FYE courses have attendance policies.

4. *Continuing discussion of CITR*

Chair Albarracin has heard concerns from faculty about the lack of information regarding what is occurring with CITR and concerns about the future availability of CITR services, and some of the employees in that area are also experiencing anxiety. She would like to see information sent to faculty about where CITR will be housed, what services it will continue to offer, and how it will change, in order to reassure faculty that resources will still be available to them, especially regarding online technology.

Provost Zoghi informed ExCo that Instructional Dawn Sweet; Information Technology Support Associate Joe Kotraba; and two graduate students will now be reporting to University Technology CIO Greg Kain as the tech side of CITR, and University Technology will move under the Vice President for Finance and Administration. He added that the other duties of CITR, which had become dormant, will move under Academic Affairs. Provost Zoghi stated that the ODES/CITR combination was very confusing, as reflected on its website. He thinks that while CITR by itself was very effective in the past in faculty development and providing support, they moved away from that service in recent years, perhaps partly due to the pandemic, and the only faculty development occurred during new faculty orientation, which is overseen by Parliamentarian Robinett.

Provost Zoghi related that a working group, which included Parliamentarian Robinett, was formed in January 2023 to discuss ODES/CITR. It held weekly meetings, conducted a SWOT analysis, and sorted through many challenges to determine how to address the needs of faculty. Provost Zoghi related that a strategy was developed

to make CITR more impactful and productive, and it was very clear at the end of the semester, after numerous meetings, that the Office of Distance Education and Support (ODES) and CITR had to be restructured.

Provost Zoghi noted that the university has struggled to acquire a new enterprise resource planning (ERP) system. When Provost Zoghi was hired, University Technology reported to the Provost's office, so for the past year he and Greg Kain have been working to make this happen. Provost Zoghi said an ERP is very expensive; the university will save money in the long run, but it will take several years. An attempt to use student fees to pay for the system was rejected by SGA. Provost Zoghi related that when the new Vice President for Finance and Administration Paul Edwards came to WIU, he shared that he had implemented several ERPs at other institutions, was quite familiar with it, and could help it become a reality quickly as opposed to waiting another three to five years. Provost Zoghi said that since Vice President Edwards had overseen units similar to University Technology in the past, it was thought that this might be a good reorganization strategy.

Senator Gravitt recalled that when Roger Runquist oversaw CITR, it was very active and offered many development programs, but since he left it has been impossible to find someone who has the passion and time to focus on it. When she began teaching at WIU, she was paid a small stipend to attend summer workshops put on by CITR on topics ranging from Bloom's taxonomy to strategies for teaching distance courses. She thinks part of the problem is that in recent years the offerings through CITR have been repetitive. Parliamentarian Robinett pointed out that anyone over the last three years who went through the new faculty orientation and mentoring program, which he oversees, is still being invited to attend a variety of different sessions (https://wiu.edu/provost/faculty_orientation/index.php). He related that Shannon Sutton, Director of Sponsored Projects, put on a wonderful session on her area last week, and faculty in attendance came from three different "starting groups." He explained this program has some of the same components as when Dr. Runquist was Director of CITR.

Parliamentarian Robinett related that the CITR task force included Communication Chair Pete Jorgensen, the SGA president, the UPI President, and faculty, so there was a wide range of representation at the weekly meetings. He related that what emerged was that the CITR portion of CITR/ODES had really fallen off. He said a distance learning survey last year asking faculty if they were interested in workshops came back with the response that they were; however, the staffing in CITR/ODES would not allow them to develop workshops because there were already very few people doing instructional design. Parliamentarian Robinett said it was apparent that something different needed to happen with CITR, and ODES needed to think in different ways and speed up the process of improving the university's distance education offerings. Provost Zoghi reiterated that the support for faculty has not really changed; the same group of people are providing the same type of support with a seamless move into another division. He added that efforts are being made to overhaul CITR, and thought is being given to how it can be taken to the next level. He is putting a team together to see how it can be more productive for faculty.

Senator Hamner understands the rationale and the need to make changes to CITR/ODES. The frustration he has heard from Quad Cities colleagues is about the timing of this happening a couple of weeks into the semester without, from their point of view, notification or explanation of how things were changing. He asked if there is something underway to better inform faculty about how services have changed or are changing, or to explain that they have not changed at all. Provost Zoghi reiterated that the level of support to faculty has not changed at all; the four employees are simply reporting now to Greg Kain. An announcement is being prepared by Communication and Marketing to inform/update the campus community and will be sent out soon. Chairperson Albarracin thinks this will help a lot because there is a lot of anxiety among faculty about this.

Parliamentarian Robinett asked if Quad Cities faculty are referring to WesternOnline support because that did, in fact, change. Support for WesternOnline will now be outsourced, but that change took place before moving the CITR/ODES duties to different divisions. Parliamentarian Robinett recalled that Ms. Sweet sent an email in July informing faculty that WesternOnline support would be outsourced to Brightspace. He explained that there is now a chatbot virtual assistant on the bottom righthand corner of WesternOnline for faculty to use if they need technical support; this offers 24/7 help for D2L. Parliamentarian Robinett wonders if QC faculty may have conflated this change with the other changes occurring with CITR. Chair Albarracin asked if Ms. Sweet will still be offering help to faculty with WesternOnline. Parliamentarian Robinett responded she will help with

instructional design and best practices for teaching online, but technical issues with WesternOnline should be worked through with Brightspace.

Ms. Hamm asked what the plans are for the CITER Advisory Committee, to which Faculty Senate makes faculty appointments. Provost Zoghi responded his office plans to form a committee to see what was offered in the past, how that can be resurrected, and what kinds of support can be provided to faculty, short-term and long-term, in order to have a very robust infrastructure in place. Parliamentarian Robinett related that discussions have occurred about asking the CITER Advisory Committee to work with Ms. Sweet on a checklist she is creating for distance education courses. UPI President Patrick McGinty informed Parliamentarian Robinett that the UPI agreement calls for the union to have input on any distance education committee, so Dr. McGinty has volunteered to help with that effort. Ms. Hamm asked if the CITER Advisory Committee would still be involved in the Provost's Travel Awards and the Provost's Awards for Excellence selection process, as they have in the past. Provost Zoghi responded these may be two different committees; Brenda McConnell and Amy Hodges in the Provost's office are currently assisting with this.

5. *Proposed revisions to charges to AI Committee and Bullying/Mobbing Committee*

Chair Albarracin attended the first meeting of both new ad hoc committees. Members of the Committee on Artificial Intelligence would like to add two student representatives – one from SGA and one international student – and to change the date for their final report to January 23, 2024. Chair Albarracin explained that papers from international students are more often flagged as having used AI because certain international students use a more formal British English. Michael Lorenzen, Malpass Library, will chair this committee. The Committee on Anti-Bullying Policies would also like to have its final report date changed to January 23. It will be chaired by Interim Human Resources Executive Director Cassandra Standberry, who has a good understanding of various discrimination and harassment policies already in existence. The proposed changes to these charges will be presented to Faculty Senate on September 26 under Reports from Committees and Councils.

6. *Proposed changes to CCPI policies and procedures*

Parliamentarian Robinett noted that CCPI has really cleaned up its policies and procedures document, making it easier to understand and more reflective of what actually occurs. He said the most significant change would correct a problem that has occurred in past years when departments put forward curricular changes without someone attending the CCPI meeting to talk about them. CCPI is proposing that unless someone from the department is present, the council will not consider the request, except in certain circumstances voted on by the members. The revised policies and procedures will be on the September 26 agenda under Reports from Committees and Councils.

7. The Executive Committee finalized the agenda for the September 26 Faculty Senate meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Office Manager
and Recording Secretary