

**WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Regular Meeting, 23 January 2018, 4:00 p.m.
Capitol Rooms - University Union**

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

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

SENATORS ABSENT: C. Tarrant

GUESTS: Julia Alberracin, Lori Baker-Sperry, Sean Cordes, Katrina Daytner, Dennis DeVolder, Bob Emmert, Steve Frazier, Christopher Ginn, Anita Hardeman, Scott Harris, Angela Lynn, Madison Lynn, Colton Markey, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Kyle Mayborn, Kristi Mindrup, Seth Miner, Russ Morgan, Jill Myers, Lorette Oden, Megan Owens, Nancy Parsons, Luciano Picanço, Bill Polley, Renee Polubinsky, Grant Reed, Joe Reinert, Jeremy Robinett, Dan Romano, Amanda Silberer, Rebecca Slater, Ron Williams, Dan Yoder

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. November 25, 2017

Correction: On p. 6 there is a typo in the third paragraph which should be corrected to read “stand-alone buildings.” (Allison)

MINUTES APPROVED AS CORRECTED

B. December 5, 2017

MINUTES APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED

II. Announcements

A. Approvals from the Provost

1. Requests for New Courses

- a. AGRN 370, No-Tillage Farming, 2 s.h.
- b. AGRN 372, Crop Science Judging, 1 s.h.
- c. AGRN 477, Weed Science Judging, 1 s.h.
- d. DS 200, Introduction to Business Analytics, 3 s.h.
- e. DS 321, Data Visualization for Decision Making, 3 s.h.
- f. DS 480, Predictive Analysis, 3 s.h.
- g. DS 485, Big Data for Business Decision Making, 3 s.h.

2. Request for New Minor

- a. Broadcasting and Journalism

3. Requests for New Majors

- a. Broadcasting and Journalism
- b. Business Analytics

4. Request for WID Designation

- a. COMM 310, Qualitative Research Methods in Communication, 3 s.h.

B. Provost's Report

Tomorrow (January 24) the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration will hold an event for alumni and friends at Horn Field Lodge as a fundraiser toward building an additional structure at that location.

A Martin Luther King, Jr. celebration will be held in Horrabin Hall on Thursday, January 25.

Monday, January 29 is the last day to enroll for classes this semester. Interim Provost Neumann asked senators to encourage students that are still trying to figure out their schedules to finalize them this week.

This semester some students were unable to come to WIU because of visa problems. The University has offered to try to zoom a class to them, and Interim Provost Neumann expressed her appreciation to the faculty members who are working to make this solution happen.

A welcome reception for new Facilities Management Director Ken Griffin will be held from 2:00-4:00 p.m. Monday, January 25 in the Physical Plant.

Interim Provost Neumann distributed lapel pins to senators. She said the former University lapel pins dated from the 1999 centennial. A donor paid for the pins. If anyone else would like to have a lapel pin, please contact Interim Provost Neumann.

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

Tonight will be the first SGA meeting of the semester.

D. Other Announcements

1. Scott Harris, Director, Office of Public Safety

Chief Harris stated that the Executive Committee asked him to look at sexual assault frequency and what is going on at the local, state, and national levels to address these issues. He told senators that there were nine sexual assaults reported to the Office of Public Safety (OPS) in 2016 and in 2017, six in 2015, four in 2014, two in 2013, and ten in 2012, so the numbers are staying fairly consistent. Chief Harris stated that the fact that there were only two reports in 2013 is concerning to him because there were almost certainly more sexual assaults than that which occurred that year, but his office can only track what is reported to them. National statistics show that one of every five woman and one of every 71 men will be sexually assaulted in their lifetimes.

Chief Harris told senators that two pieces of sexual assault legislation were recently approved by the state legislature. The Preventing a Sexual Assault in Higher Education Act requires that confidential advisors be appointed for victims and that the advisors have 40 hours of training. Any communication between the survivor and the confidential advisor is privileged. Chief Harris reported that the Act also includes improved reporting requirements, and survivors will have better rights than previously. The deadline for annual reporting of this data by the various institutions to the state Attorney General's office was November 2017; WIU met this requirement. The Attorney General's office will make public the names of those institutions that did not report by the deadline.

The state legislature also passed the Illinois Sexual Assault Incidence Procedure Act. This requires mandatory report writing of all sexual assaults that are reported, even if the assault turns out not to have occurred on the campus, for instance, or occurred in a different jurisdiction. Chief Harris told senators that if the assault occurred in Blandinsville, Chicago, or the city of Macomb, OPS offices will still provide every assistance to the victim. Officers are required to assist the victim, take the report, get the victim to the hospital, notify the appropriate agencies, provide the victim with information regarding the appropriate contact persons, and transmit the report to the overseeing agency, which was not always done in the past by all reporting agencies if the assault occurred outside their individual jurisdictions. The law also requires that officers handling cases of sexual assault be specifically trained. Three OPS officers have been specially trained and must be retrained every three years.

The Attorney General awarded a \$500,000 state sexual assault grant in August 2017, and McDonough County was part of that pilot program. The grant funds sexual assault nurse examiners to help survivors. Chief Harris told senators that WIU's Interpersonal Violence Prevention Committee was created in 2009 and includes representatives from University divisions, including Beu Health Center, Athletics, and Title IX, as well as the State's Attorney's office, the Western Illinois Regional Council, and the City of Macomb. Chief Harris also serves on the Committee, and Jenny Hemingway, Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration, is the faculty representative. The Committee meets quarterly to talk about issues and consider ways to better assist students, survivors, and the WIU campus.

April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month. The Office of Public Safety will have programming throughout the month. OPS offers one Rape Awareness Defense (RAD) class each during spring and fall semesters. OPS also offered a special RAD class last summer for academic advisors.

Chief Harris wrote a letter of support to Sydney John, Coordinator for the McDonough County Victim Witness Program, to accompany a grant that she is trying to obtain. Chief Harris would like to see her obtain the grant because some of her clients are survivors that OPS has worked with, and the grant would benefit them.

A student organization associated with the Women's Center will bring the It's On Us national sexual assault awareness campaign to the WIU campus. OPS will partner with the group on programming they want to do this fall during Welcome Back Week. Chief Harris finds it encouraging that students want to get involved in this effort, which will be called WIU: It's On Us.

OPS offers a bystander intervention video on their website. OPS would like to find a student group that wants to take the bystander intervention training and help promote it.

2. Steve Frazier, Chief Information Office, University Technology

Mr. Frazier told senators that University Technology has been able to reduce the number of wireless complaints on campus and has simplified the onboarding process. He stated that University Technology ran into some glitches when working with the guest accounts, so they are still fine-tuning the system.

The STARS system has been redesigned by Administrative Information Management Systems (AIMS) to be more intuitive with responsive design for mobile devices. Mr. Frazier reported that the changes have been well received by students.

University Technology has been doing more phishing training this semester. They plan to send three phishing messages out to the University community.

Vice President Matt Bierman is chairing a task force to investigate Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) -- what other institutions have, their business processes, and how WIU should migrate its data.

uTech is making an effort to extend its support hours. STARS pin resets were formerly done during non-business hours but will now be done on weekends and evenings. He added that walk-in support will now be offered during lunch hours.

When WIU renewed its Educause membership, Educause bundled all three of its offerings, or constituencies, into one license. Mr. Frazier said the Educause Learning Initiative (ELI) is now available to all faculty and can be accessed at www.Educause.edu/eli. More information on this will be uploaded to the uTech website in the near future.

Mr. Frazier related that Jim Schmidt met with Interim Provost Neumann about the Morgan Hall fourth floor wiring, which is old and causing a lot of problems. The Provost's office will provide funding to fix those problems, allowing for uTech to make plans to move forward with cap-free cable. Chairperson Rock asked when the changes to the fourth floor of Morgan will take place. Mr. Frazier replied that University Technology needs to get the funds first. Dan Romano, Director of Infrastructure for University Technology, added that the funding is still being worked out, but once that is in place University Technology has a technician that will start the work, which will take about five weeks to complete. He anticipates that it will be completed before the semester is over. Chairperson Rock has heard a lot of frustration from his colleagues in terms of their inability to access their online courses and get on the internet. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad related she has been communicating with her dean and with uTech because she is incredibly frustrated by the situation. She has two online courses and today could not access the internet again; when she is typing in her Gmail account, for example, her cursor frequently sticks, and many things have been tried to remedy the situation. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad stated that, while she appreciates that things seem to be moving forward, five weeks for a fix pushes the date almost to the middle of term. She added that to have to go to her home to work on her personal computer whenever she has work to do for her department's online major is frustrating. Mr. Frazier explained that in the past, each college has traditionally determined what funds they would have available for technology, and there was a lot of disparity among the different areas, which led to such issues as some colleges having better wiring than others. University Technology would like to try to centralize that funding and bring all areas up to a certain norm. He assured senators that University Technology will get to the Morgan Hall wiring fix as quickly as they can and are prepared to move as soon as they have the funds. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad applauds the University for taking this step because, just as technology and culture are changing, the student body is changing, and, whether they are on campus or not, they, as well as the faculty, deserve to have the best online experience possible, so not investing in infrastructure is not a wise choice.

Senator Allison noted that repairs to the wireless system have fixed the guest accounts, but she wonders if people are still reporting problems with the secure accounts because she still gets kicked off of it frequently and receives messages telling her to reload or that she is not authorized. Rebecca Slater, Director for User Support Services for University Technology, responded that uTech is struggling to try to identify the problem when calls come in to the service center. She related that there was a level of frustration in the beginning, but people are not necessarily reporting the occurrences when they happen. uTech mostly gets reports from students saying they have been kicked off the system, and uTech can consult those logs, but they are receiving limited reports so it is difficult to identify the potential root cause of the problem. Ms. Slater stated that uTech employees

also routinely experience this problem, and they try to pull the logs at the back end to see if they have a common access point or operating system. She stated that all individuals on the north side of the fourth floor of Morgan Hall are experiencing problems, but uTech does not get enough individuals reporting the problems to pull that data. She advised senators who routinely have this problem to send an email to support@wiu.edu with their ecom user name so uTech can start documenting where these issues are being received. Senator Allison suggested that University Technology send a message to the campus community with this information because, although she will start calling in more and will pass the information along to her department, that message needs to go farther. Ms. Slater said University Technology will do an announcement in the February Campus Connection about the expansion of support opportunities, but this information can be added explaining that if uTech had more reports of incidents when they occur they could do better tracking. Senator Allison suggested that the message be sent out in another way, such as TeleSTARS. Senator Perabo suggested that a message on Western Online could ask individuals to report when they have a problem. Senator Hironimus-Wendt noted that the external offices on the fourth floor of Morgan seem to experience the problems rather than the interior offices.

3. Election notices have been sent to eligible faculty to fill vacancies on Faculty Senate. There is an immediate opening for a faculty member from the College of Business and Technology to serve a one-semester term for Spring 2018. The College of Business and Technology also has a two-year vacancy beginning in Fall 2018. There are also Fall 2018 vacancies for the College of Arts and Sciences (one three-year and one one-year term), WIU Quad Cities (one three-year term), and Senators At-Large (two three-year terms). More information can be found at http://www.wiu.edu/faculty_senate/elections.php.
2. The evaluations of President Thomas and Interim Provost Neumann will be sent to eligible full-time faculty via email on February 2. The due date for completion of the surveys is February 16. The evaluation form has been shortened this year to encourage increased faculty participation in the process.
4. Chairperson Rock welcomed new Senator Sterling Saddler, who will be replacing Gloria Delaney-Barmann while she is on sabbatical this semester.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

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

1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
 - a. Requests for New Courses
 - i. FL 121, Less Commonly Taught Languages I, 3 s.h.

Senator Perabo asked if the department will be bringing in Fulbright Scholars to teach the classes; Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures Chair Luciano Picanço confirmed this is correct. He told senators this is a joint effort between the department and the Center for International Studies. He related that since he came to WIU, many people have told him they would like to see different languages offered at the University, and Dr. Picanço thinks a good way to deal with this is to partner with the Fulbright Scholars Program. He added that the languages offered can change each year to meet the needs of different departments. Senator Perabo asked if a number of students have to request a certain language, such as Arabic, and then WIU submits the request to the

Fulbright Foundation. Dr. Picanço replied that the request has to be submitted a year in advance. He stated that for the first request the department asked for Fulbright Scholars to teach Arabic and Russian, adding that the ROTC program has expressed an interest in Arabic. He added that the department will see what the reception is on campus, but the idea is to diversity and assist other departments.

- ii. FL 122, Less Commonly Taught Languages II, 3 s.h.

Chairperson Rock asked if FL122 will be offered the second semester; Dr. Picanço confirmed this is correct. Senator Roberts asked if what is being offered will be a year of the same course. Dr. Picanço replied there will be two levels of the same language offered over the course of the year.

NEW COURSES APPROVED

- B. Senate Nominating Committee
(Ginny Boynton, Chair)

SENATE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES:

<u>Council for Instructional Technology</u>				
Amy Burke, Comm Sci & Disorders	replacing	Ian Shelly	FA&C	Fall 2020

UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES:

<u>FYE Committee on Classes</u>				
Brian Locke, Music	replacing	Julie Dalmasso	FA&C	Fall 2018

<u>University Diversity Council</u>				
Leslie O’Ryan, Counselor Education	replacing	Andrea Hyde	WIUQC	Fall 2020

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

IV. Old Business

- A. CCPI Review of Comprehensive Majors and Academic Terms

Chairperson Rock reminded senators that CCPI originally brought forth four proposals, and Faculty Senate has rejected one of them. He would like for senators to discuss the remaining three to see if they can reach closure. He recalled that Faculty Senate at the last meeting spent some time discussing semantic differences between “does not” and “cannot” in the definition of a comprehensive major – specifically, the current language says “Does not require completion of a Minor as part of the degree program,” which CCPI has proposed changing to “Cannot require completion of a Minor as part of the degree program.” He suggested that senators may want to make a decision which language they would prefer to recommend.

Senator Boynton observed that History-Teacher Education has the equivalent of two minors as part of the major; although not formal minors, students must take 24 hours of social science and 40 hours of education courses in addition to the 39 hours of History courses as part of the comprehensive major. She asked for confirmation that the “cannot require” language would not do away with those choices but is rather referring to requiring students to take additional minors as part of the comprehensive major. CCPI Chair Anita Hardeman confirmed that is what the language is intended to prevent. Senator Boynton asked why it is being proposed that students not be allowed to have a minor if they are in a comprehensive major. Dr. Hardeman responded that it is not that students are not allowed to take a minor but that the program for the comprehensive major

cannot *require* the completion of a minor in addition to the requirements for a comprehensive major. She related that originally all majors required a minor, and the comprehensive major was a new way of looking at things; the comprehensive major encompasses a cluster of courses that represent some of the components of a minor, but that cluster does not necessarily correspond to a pre-existing minor on campus.

Senator Allison stated that “cannot” does not mean the same as “does not” to her; “cannot” means “you cannot.” Chairperson Rock stated that it does not mean that a student cannot do a minor but that a minor cannot be required. Senator Locke suggested that better wording might be “may, but is not required to.” He added that this may not be the desired wording, but he thinks the key word is “require.”

Dr. Hardeman provided senators with an example of the difference between “cannot” and “does not.” She explained that she might say, “I *do not* vote in the election,” which would be a choice that is open to her, but, as a Canadian citizen, she actually *cannot* vote in the election, and there is a difference between those two things. She pointed out that individuals look at the Terms Related to Academic Programming chart as a guideline for creating their own programming, so it is important to be explicit and clear about what the expectations are, which is why CCPI looked closely at the vocabulary changes.

Senator Boynton asked what the problem is with a comprehensive major also requiring a minor. She pointed out that students can take a minor with a comprehensive major if they choose to do so, so she does not see why the program cannot require that. Dr. Hardeman responded that the comprehensive major in Art allows students the *option* to complete a minor or to take other courses. Senator Boynton asked if the CCPI report, if approved, would eliminate that. Dr. Hardeman replied that it would not because Art students are not *required* to complete a minor; it is a choice that they can make, but they have other options. Senator Boynton said she cannot see why it is a problem for a comprehensive major to require a minor if it is in the best interest of the program. Dr. Hardeman replied that in that case the program would be a non-comprehensive major. Senator Boynton pointed out that a comprehensive major may include courses that are applicable to a minor, so she does not see why they are prohibited from requiring those courses as a minor if it is in the best interests of their students. Dr. Hardeman replied that it is a credit load issue; in a comprehensive major, students are required to complete a degree plan that is 50, 70, or 100 hours, and then would be asked to add an additional 15-18 hour minor on top of that, and that is what CCPI is trying to avoid. Senator Boynton stated that 43 hours are Gen Ed (for colleges other than Arts and Sciences); if a comprehensive major is 48 hours, adding a 16-hour minor would be 107 hours, so that still leaves room to shuffle courses around. She added that a double major is equivalent to a major and a minor.

Computer Sciences Director Dennis DeVolder pointed out that senators have debated “does not require” and “cannot require,” but when he reads the report from an operational standpoint it does not change anything; a minor will not be allowed in a proposal for a comprehensive major under either wording, but students can pursue a minor if they choose to. He added that “does not” and “cannot” mean the same thing because from an operational standpoint they will result in the same thing.

Interim Provost Neumann suggested “Completion of a minor as part of the degree plan is not required” to replace “Does not require completion of a Minor as part of the degree program” or “Cannot require completion of a Minor as part of the degree program.”

Senator McIlvaine-Newsad related that last year’s Executive Committee looked at over 30 peer institutions, and WIU is the only one that is doing things this way, which makes things more challenging for students. She thinks that students are often unintentionally encouraged not to explore things that do not appear to be on face value as complementary or necessary for themselves. She noted that a dual major in Anthropology and Computer Science, for example, may not appear to be a logical pairing for many people but makes a lot of sense to her because

anthropologists are among the most highly employed people in the computer science industry because they study how people have relationships with material and non-material cultures. She fears that when language is used that is so restricted, students may not be encouraged to look at pairings that do not appear to be beneficial to each other, such as Mathematics and Music, which are both languages.

Senator Allison likes the wording proposed by Interim Provost Neumann. She thinks language like “cannot” is more restricted than “does not,” and that sends a message. She would prefer to use Interim Provost Neumann’s language or leave the wording as it is currently. Parliamentarian Kaul also likes Interim Provost Neumann’s language and thinks that “cannot” and “does not” can easily be removed. Dr. Hardeman agreed that this sounds reasonable. Chairperson Rock stated that senators can determine whether to go with the language CCPI proposed, Interim Provost Neumann’s language, or the existing language for this section.

Motion: To adopt Interim Provost Neumann’s language as a friendly amendment to the report (Locke/Sandage)

Senator Hironimus-Wendt observed that the proposal is coming from a Senate subcommittee, so to try to change it would be the same as amending current policy. He thinks senators should either vote for or against the recommendation as a whole or send it back to the council at this point. Parliamentarian Kaul pointed out that there was a motion and a second to accept the CCPI report at a previous Senate meeting, and that motion is currently being debated, so the current motion would be to amend the original report.

MOTION APPROVED 22 YES – 1 NO – 0 AB

“Completion of a minor as part of the degree plan is not required” will replace the current language – “Does not require completion of a Minor as part of the degree program” – as part of the definition of a comprehensive major.

Chairperson Rock suggested that senators now consider the next CCPI recommendation, changes to the definition of an option. Dr. Hardeman explained that the current definition of an option describes it as including 9 s.h. of “unique, invariant, required courses.” At the request of the Executive Committee, CCPI removed “invariant” and in subsequent discussion at CCPI decided that “unique” was not required either. To simplify the language, CCPI just stated that non-comprehensive majors will have at least 9 s.h. of required courses and comprehensive majors will have at least 12 s.h. of required courses, and that all options within a single major will have the same core. Senator Boynton asked if this means that options do not have to have the same required courses and whether they are unique and invariant. Dr. Hardeman replied that all WIU courses are unique, and “invariant” was removed at the request of ExCo. Senator Boynton asked if there can be an “or” within the core. Dr. Hardeman replied that CCPI says that the core hours must be consistent for all options within the degree, which CCPI thought was encompassed within the word “invariant.” Senator Allison asked if stating that all options within a single major will have the same core means there is to be no “or” in the core and if there cannot be difference within a major across options in the core. Dr. Hardeman confirmed this is correct. Senator Allison asked if the only change to the existing definition is taking “unique, invariant” out. Parliamentarian Kaul confirmed this is correct.

Senator Perabo asked what is meant in the existing option definition by “Subdivision which provides greater specificity within a major.” Dr. Hardeman replied that this is talking about the option itself. Senator Perabo suggested that perhaps language be added before this statement, such as “includes,” which would make it parallel with the other bullet points. Dr. Hardeman replied that CCPI did not change the original language.

Motion: To accept CCPI proposed language for the option (Pawelko/Locke)

MOTION APPROVED 20 YES – 1 NO – 1 AB

Motion: To accept the report as it is amended in its entirety (Hironimus-Wendt/Saddler)

Dr. DeVolder pointed out that at an earlier meeting Faculty Senate had voted to remove CCPI's proposed changes to the definition of a minor and keep the existing language because of concerns about requiring minors to have a core. He asked if senators meant to also eliminate that part of the recommended changes which would require minors to include upper division hours. He noted that there was a lot of discussion about this at CCPI, specifically whether it should be a recommendation or a requirement, and he wants to make sure before senators vote on the entire report that they meant to remove this requirement. Senator Allison said she had questions about the language stating minors "should require" upper division hours so was okay with removing this recommendation.

Senator Allison asked if there was an attempt to define discipline, program, and core in the report, as required under #5 in the charge. Dr. Hardeman asked what Senator Allison's definition of a discipline would be; Senator Allison replied that she has no idea, and Dr. Hardeman stated that neither did CCPI. She explained that CCPI instead chose to indicate that a discipline is a fluid and changing body of knowledge with some sense of coherency which CCPI felt could be identified by:

- a consistent set of faculty qualifications and backgrounds;
- cohesive scholarly or creative output;
- an established course of study;
- recognition by an accrediting or professional body;
- a classification of instructional programs (CIP) code.

Dr. Hardeman stressed that CCPI's list is not intended to be prohibitive or proscriptive but is just some ways that a discipline can be identified. She explained that, in comparison to discipline, program is something that is put forward by an academic department and constitutes a course of study; a course of study is fixed and should follow a discipline, which is changing and evolves. Senator Allison said that what she is hearing is that a program is not analogous to a department but exists within a department. Dr. Hardeman confirmed this is correct because someone must be responsible for administering a program. Senator Allison agreed and asked if this individual would be a chair or director. Dr. Hardeman responded that this could vary from program to program; interdisciplinary programs may have to give some thought and development as to who will be responsible, while other programs might have a very close correlation, and still other programs may be grouped together administratively. She explained that a program is not necessarily equivalent to a discipline; a discipline may encompass multiple programs, one single program, may not be represented by a complete program, or include an interdisciplinary approach. She added that deciding where programs live is not the responsibility of CCPI but of administrators. Senator Allison asked if this means a department determines its own programs; Dr. Hardeman responded that in most cases that has been true. She stated that, for example, English decides what make a B.A. degree in English; it must go through the appropriate channels of approval, but ultimately the force for change is the department and the faculty. Senator Allison stated that this discussion seems to bring up December 2015 when "programs" became an operative word [for faculty layoffs], what is what makes her nervous. She stated that this may not be within CCPI's purview, but it is a "sticky wicket." She wonders what consequences the definition of program might have.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt said that, in responding to Dr. DeVolder's question about whether senators have considered that their actions would eliminate the requirement for upper division classes in the minor, he has considered it and is comfortable with it. On the program issue, he thinks of programs as local and disciplines as global. He stated that if, for example, a Gerontology major were to be created, there may not be disciplinary experts in that field at WIU, but an interdisciplinary major could be created using the expertise of anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, health scientists, and others to deliver it. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that a program is more flexible and may or may not be a discipline. He likes the definition related to the

criteria of a discipline that CCPI has included. He added that program is housed in a department somewhere but may not be a formal discipline.

Senator Boynton asked if anyone has any arguments for or against upper division courses in a minor. Associate Program Parsons stated that the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) guidelines state that a minor should include upper division hours, but the IBHE does not approve minors. Senator Boynton asked if the lack of upper division hours will make any difference to the Higher Learning Commission. Associate Programs Parsons responded that it will not, but their inclusion helps students obtain the required number of upper division hours for their degree programs. Senator Hironimus-Wendt pointed out that CCPI did not propose that upper division hours *must* be required for minors but that they *should* be included. He asked if this were to be imposed whether Faculty Senate is prepared to grandfather in half of the existing minors that do not include upper division hours or would prefer to err on the side of leaving the existing language alone since IBHE does not require this. Dr. Hardeman stated that when CCPI considered the deadline for completion of any changes as a result of their report, they considered those minors who would have to make this change and for that reason decided upon a deadline of Spring 2019.

Senator Czechowski asked where the discussion ended regarding the definition of a program. She noted that Art majors can get a degree in Studio Art, Art Education, and Graphic Design; within Studio Art there are eight different studio areas, and she wonders if those areas are considered to be programs. She does not think that the eight studio areas are separate programs but that they constitute one program within the Department of Art. Senator Czechowski related that when she was laid off on December 8, 2015, she was told it was because there was redundancy in a program, so she is trying to figure out what is considered a program. Associate Program Parsons responded that there are only two degrees in Art – the B.A. and the B.F.A. The other areas that Senator Czechowski listed – Studio Art, Art Education, and Graphic Design – are options; a student cannot get a degree in one of these areas but can major in Art with an option in Graphic Design, Studio Art, or Art Education. She explained that the instructional program is based on the degree program, the B.A. or B.F.A. in Art. Associate Provost Parsons stated that the CIP code has six digits; two digits indicate the large area, and the specificity within that discipline are indicated by the other four digits. She added that for the example of Art, there are only two CIP codes – one for the B.A. and the other for the B.F.A. Senator Czechowski asked what the programs are within Art. Associate Provost Parsons responded that they would be the B.A. and the B.F.A.; there are options, which are subunits of coursework, but they are not given separate CIP codes. She added that the entire degree is given one CIP code. Senator Czechowski asked if this means that when she was told in 2015 that there was redundancy in her program, that was not true; Associate Provost Parsons responded that she was not there and has no knowledge of what is being asked. Senator Czechowski stated that when faculty were laid off, she was told her lay off was because there was redundancy in her printmaking program, but it seems that Associate Provost Parsons is saying that there is no printmaking program, only an Art program. Associate Provost Parsons responded that the layoffs were not an area that she addressed in her responsibilities within the Provost's office; she addressed the graduate program review and cannot answer Senator Czechowski's question in her role in the Provost's office.

Senator Allison pointed out that the fifth charge to CCPI was “an examination into what constitutes a discipline, a program, and a core,” and program is what concerns her. She wonders if “program” is being used the same way across the campus or if there are multiple definitions because she is confused. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out that there are different types of programs: majors are one type of program, minors are another type, and post-baccalaureate certificates are the third. Senator Allison stated that in that case the word is being used differently across the campus. She said that when Senator Hironimus-Wendt was speaking earlier, program seemed analogous to department, and later it did not seem analogous to department but rather tucked into a department. Associate Provost Parsons explained that a department is an administrative unit; programs are housed within departments, or across departments if they are interdisciplinary; for instance, the English B.A. is not housed in the Department of History but in the Department of English. She added that her home department has B.S. degrees in Public Health, Emergency Management, and

Health Services Management and a B.S.W. in Social Work, so several different degrees are housed within the administrative unit of Health Sciences and Social Work. Senator Czechowski asked Associate Provost Parsons if she can confirm that there are two programs in Art: the B.A. and the B.F.A. Associate Provost Parsons confirmed this is correct.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt pointed out that the current CCPI proposal does not include any definition of program, so he would like to suggest that Faculty Senate accept the report and charge the Executive Committee to ask the Provost's office to provide the Senate with a formal definition of the construct "program" to be evaluated at a future meeting. He is comfortable with the definitions that CCPI has proposed, but the issue is that Faculty Senate wants to know what a program is, so he thinks there should be a separate charge. He thinks that if the Provost's office could provide a formal definition of "program" it would solve a lot of the problem. Chairperson Rock pointed out that there is a motion on the floor, and once that is voted on the senator could make another recommendation that would go to ExCo.

Registrar Angela Lynn pointed out that pp. 13-18 of the undergraduate catalog list academic programs, including degrees, options, minors, and fields of study. She thinks that when individuals are looking for the definition of programs, the University has already defined it; it is already broad and encompasses many different things. She stated that it talks about degree programs, such as the B.A. and B.F.A., but also academic programs, which are fields of study – things that students might major and minor in. Senator Pawelko suggested that perhaps Associate Provost Parsons and the Registrar could clarify some of the other terms that are in the proposal as well, such as tracks, options, and emphases, and give some examples that exist on campus. Dr. Lynn replied that options are areas of specialty within the major (which is within the degree program), such as Art Studio and Graphic Design. She stated that a concentration is for interdisciplinary studies only; Associate Provost Parsons added that a concentration is synonymous with an option within a major. Dr. Lynn explained that a track is the most informal definition and is used when departments want to focus on certain things; students can take a clump of classes, but the track is not transcribed anywhere. She said that students can be advised that if they are interested in an area, they can take a certain clump of classes, which is considered a track. Associate Provost Parsons stated that an emphasis is a step up from a track and is also not transcribed. Dr. Lynn added that an emphasis is an approved subset of courses and is shown in the catalog, but for whatever reason the department has chosen not to create an option. Associate Provost Parsons stated that in Health Services Management there are three emphases (Long-Term Care, Private Sector, and Public Sector), but they will not show on students' transcripts. Parliamentarian Kaul stated that a track is mostly used as guidance for the student. He asked if it would help to mention that emphases and tracks are only guides but are not transcribed. Dr. Hardeman replied that this information is already on the academic terms chart. Senator Boynton added that tracks are useful for reference letters and applications.

Senator Locke asked if examination of "program" can be removed from the CCPI report; Dr. Hardeman responded that this is part of the original charge from Faculty Senate. Senator Boynton pointed out that there is no language about that examination in the report. Senator Perabo asked if it was a deliberate decision that a definition of program not be provided in this section. Dr. Hardeman responded that CCPI understands what a program is, and she does not think it occurred to the council that they needed to redefine something that is already defined in the undergraduate catalog because this would be redundant. Senator Perabo suggested that perhaps that information should be noted in this section. She observed that concerns about the term "program" seem related to the impact it has on faculty jobs, and she wonders if there is any way in the report to indicate that CCPI is not endorsing a particular view of a program. She thinks there needs to be something in the report that addresses those concerns and, in turn, makes senators feel better about those other sections of the report which seem to be less controversial.

Senator Rahman pointed out that there are two definitions of programs: the one in the undergraduate catalog and the definition outlined by Associate Provost Parsons concerning degree programs. She noted that the degree program definition relates to faculty jobs and makes many faculty uncomfortable, while the catalog description seems to include everything and everyone, and

this is the basis for the confusion. Dr. Hardeman stated that a program is a course of study. Senator Boynton pointed out that not all courses of study are degrees. Dr. Hardeman responded that minors and post-baccalaureate certificates are also programs. Associate Provost Parsons clarified that degrees are those letters that occur after a name – B.A., B.F.A., B.S., B.S.W. are degrees. Academic programs are subunits of degrees – majors, minors, post-baccalaureate certificates. She added that this goes back to the original creation of the matrix called the Terms Related to Academic Programming.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that while the catalog does list three to four pages of fields of study, it does not define a program, which is why he suggested that ExCo charge CCPI or the Provost's office to come up with a formal definition. He said that if one wants to show what are fields of study, the catalog is a great resource, but there is the need for a formal definition because that is the problem that Faculty Senate is running into. Parliamentarian Kaul stated that, according to the catalog, it seems that a program may include a major, minor, concentration, or other terms. He agrees that someone needs to glean that language and that it might be helpful to ask the Provost's office to do that for future reference. Dr. DeVolder observed that action on the CCPI report is being held up by the definition of a program.

Senator Allison observed that the charge to CCPI was to examine what constitutes a discipline, program, and core, and she wonders why that was charged. She wonders if since senators cannot understand what a program is, whether that was the purpose for the charge. She pointed out that the report does not say that CCPI examined "program" and determined anything from their examination. Senator Czechowski stated that she would like to see this resolved. She does not want to approve a document where she does not believe it is giving senators all of the answers they have asked for. She would like the Provost's office, with CCPI, to come up with a definition, include that in the report, then review the report again and vote on it. She does not believe the CCPI report and the definition of a program are two different things, and she thinks the information needs to be included in the document.

Parliamentarian Kaul suggested that senators could remove #5 and approve the rest of the document without that section, then #5 can be debated and discussed separately. Senator Czechowski stated that the original charge was voted on by the Faculty Senate, and #5 was in the original charge. She said that until it will be more work, she would like the vote on the document to be postponed two weeks while the definition of a program can be added. Chairperson Rock pointed out that there is a motion on the floor that could be retracted if desired or amended. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that he senses the will of the Senate and will retract the motion.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Motion: To send the report back to CCPI as per the discussions at Faculty Senate and for CCPI to answer all of the charges they were asked (Czechowski/Pawelko)

Senator Roberts asked if it can be specified that the only question remaining is #5; Senator Czechowski agreed.

MOTION APPROVED 14 YES – 3 NO – 4 AB

Dr. Hardeman asked if senators specifically want a definition of a program; Senator Czechowski confirmed this is correct.

V. New Business

A. Bylaws Amendment to Create Budget Transparency Committee

1. First Reading

Second reading and vote will occur at the Senate meeting of February 6.

B. Discussion of Immigration Task Force

Following upon a resolution from Faculty Senate in May 2017 requesting that the administration “convene a task force dedicated to investigating, considering and creating policy as appropriate” regarding immigrant students, the President’s office, in conjunction with Student Affairs, has developed a list of task force members. The members of the task force thus far include: Interim Provost Kathy Neumann; Vice President, Student Services Ron Williams; Registrar Angela Lynn; Mellissa Telles, Associate Director, Admissions; Financial Aid Director Terri Hare; Jeff Hancks, Director, and Dana Sistko, Assistant Director, Center for International Studies; Counseling Center Director Jim DiTulio; Beu Health Center Director John Smith; General Counsel Rica Calhoun; OPS Director Scott Harris; Associate Vice President, Student Affairs Jason Woods, representing the Multicultural Center; Casa Latina Cultural Center Director Rocio Ayard Ochoa; and faculty member Munia Cabal-Jimenez, Foreign Languages and Literatures. The administration has asked Faculty Senate to provide the names of one additional faculty member from each college to add to the task force, but they suggested that Senator Lino be the representative from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Chairperson Rock pointed out to senators that Julia Alberracin, Political Science, really brought the issue to the forefront of Faculty Senate’s attention, and he thinks she should be included on the task force in addition to the faculty representatives from each college. He added that, since it is a large committee, he does not anticipate any problems with the administration acceding to this request.

Chairperson Rock asked if Senator Lino has already been contacted about serving on the task force. Senator Lino responded that he has been and has already attended a meeting. Chairperson Rock asked if there are any other nominations from senators from the College of Arts and Sciences for this position. There were no other nominations, and Senator Lino was declared elected. Chairperson Rock asked if senators from any other colleges are interested in serving on the task force. Senator Locke volunteered to represent the College of Fine Arts and Communication. There were no further nominations, and Senator Locke was also declared elected.

Motion: To ask that Professor Alberracin be added to the committee because this is only fitting since she is the originator of the proposal (Hironimus-Wendt/Tasdan)

MOTION APPROVED 20 YES – 0 NO – 1 AB

The Senate Nominating Committee was asked to determine the remaining two task force representatives from the Colleges of Business and Technology and Education and Human Services.

C. Gauging Faculty Senate Interest in Having an Ad Hoc Committee to Analyze the Academic Component of FYE

Chairperson Rock related that some senators have raised concerns about the efficacy of the First Year Experience (FYE) program. Senator Roberts has asked the Executive committee to ask the Provost’s office to provide information evaluating whether the FYE program has a positive effect on WIU’s student recruitment and/or enrollment. Chairperson Rock told senators the Executive Committee wondered if an ad hoc committee of the Senate should be created to address this question because it would give the Senate control over the committee, senators are interested in this question, and the committee would need to hear from a variety of voices. Associate Provost Parsons sent a list to the Senate Chair of individuals she thinks would be appropriate to have on an ad hoc committee in addition to senators. Chairperson Rock asked senators if they are interested in creating such a committee.

Senator Rahman noted that the email from Senator Roberts did not recommend creating a committee. She asked if a committee is the best way to move forward. Chairperson Rock responded that information would be great, but rather than having it come from an administration committee the Executive Committee thought it would be better if Faculty Senate had ownership. He recalled that when FYE was discussed previously at Faculty Senate, there were a lot of senators with issues about the program, and he thinks the Senate should control the committee.

Senator Roberts stated that, while it was not his suggestion to create an ad hoc committee, he supports the Executive Committee's recommendation. He observed that FYE's mission as stated on its website is to "help all incoming first-year students make a successful transition to college from their previous educational or life experiences." He noted that the focus of UNIV 100 is on how students can successfully transition to WIU. Senator Roberts stated that faculty have known for several years that the administration is very eager to think about student enrollment and retention, and it seems that those are really important elements of, if not synonymous with, what is meant when student success is discussed. Senator Roberts suspects that information is available that would help Faculty Senate understand the effectiveness of the two FYE programs (Y classes and UNIV 100), and he supports faculty being involved in clarifying that information, including the history of FYE so far and its impact. Senator Roberts realizes that other factors impact student retention at WIU, but he pointed out that FYE is a flagship program for entering students, and information should be able to be gathered that would be useful in determining its net impact.

Chairperson Rock stated that Associate Provost Parsons sent him some information on an FYE report from 2011, which could be shared with all senators or provided to an ad hoc committee. He asked if it is the will of the Senate to create an ad hoc committee to look at the academic component of FYE. Senator Boynton asked what kind of timeline would be assigned to the ad hoc committee. Chairperson Rock responded that the committee could take whatever time needed – the remainder of this semester or into next fall. Senator Boynton expressed her support of creating such a committee to conduct some in-depth examination of the issues related to FYE. Chairperson Rock pointed out that decisions would have to be made regarding how many people should serve on the committee, and senators should be asked if they are interested in serving. He pointed out that Senator Macchi is a very strong voice for FYE, and it would be helpful to have her on the committee, adding that some individuals have more of a vested interest in FYE than others.

Senator Perabo asked if there is already an FYE committee on the campus; Chairperson Rock responded that there is but it is not a committee of the Senate. Senator Macchi, who serves as the FYE Faculty Associate, added that the Senate appoints faculty representatives to the FYE Committee on Classes. Chairperson Rock asked if the committee members are only faculty; Senator Macchi responded that it is composed of faculty and others with involvement in the classes portion of FYE. Senator Perabo asked if the examination could be done by the committee that already exists. Senator Macchi stated that the list of names sent to Chairperson Rock are individuals on the FYE Leadership Committee's subcommittee, the Program Evaluation Committee, which this year has been charged with looking at the information from the past five years of the new iteration of FYE. She added that this committee already has that information and is starting to go through it. She said what Faculty Senate is asking for could be provided by this subcommittee, but there are no senators serving on the subcommittee.

Senator Saddler asked if there are some criteria that the subcommittee is looking for regarding FYE. Senator Macchi explained that Educational Studies professor Tom Cody has been analyzing FYE data and has provided the subcommittee with all of the results. She stated that the 2011 report was done from the old iteration of FYE, when FYE classes were offered in the fall and spring semesters. She explained that after this report there was a review of FYE, and out of that review UNIV 100 was begun, and the decision was made to offer both FYE classes in the fall; now, students only take FYE in the spring if they could not pass the fall class, withdrew from the fall class, or if the student is a new incoming freshman in the spring. Since the new iteration of FYE, students have been asked to take a survey at the end of the semester in their FYE classes, but the survey in the past was very cumbersome. The survey has provided information since AY 2013-14,

but beginning last spring a new survey has been distributed which should give better information than in the past. Senator Macchi told senators that the previous survey included multiple variables on multiple questions which was cumbersome to input, which is why it has taken Dr. Cody so long to compile the results. The new survey was piloted in Spring 2017 in three Y sections, and the Program Evaluation Committee now has the results of those surveys so they are getting more information about the Y portion of FYE. Senator Macchi stated that there is not as much information about the Y portion of FYE because Y faculty often do not go to FYE training, respond to FYE emails, or participate in FYE surveys.

Jeremy Robinett, Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration professor, told senators that he serves on the Program Evaluation Committee. He said the committee is also looking at how other institutions assess first-year experience opportunities, which some schools call University Life and others call Ongoing Orientation Programs. He related that over the winter break the committee members started to collect academic journals and dissertations about FYE and are endeavoring to see if the information they are collecting is representative of what WIU is trying to say with its program, what FYE is and is not achieving, and what it measures. He added that they are also trying to make sense of how the data has changed over the years in order to present an overall picture. Chairperson Rock told senators that another option the Senate has is to wait until this information is compiled and assessed, then senators can take a look at it and decide if they want to do something at that time.

Senator Boynton stated that senators recently received a report on D and F grades in UNIV 100 and Y classes, which seemed to spark some of the discussion at Faculty Senate. She asked if the Program Evaluation Committee is also looking into this. Senator Macchi responded that they are not looking at it in terms of retention because numerous factors affect retention. She said FYE leadership look at the failure rates every semester and are trying to make some tweaks to address problems. She related that last year it was noticed that a lot of students were failing their FYE courses, so this spring individual meetings were held with every student in UNIV 100 classes, and the College Success Factor Index (CSFI) was introduced. She explained that CSFI can help identify some of the needs of students at the beginning of the semester so that UNIV 100 can work toward addressing those needs. Since this plan was successful last spring, it has now been implemented University wide. Senator Macchi related that this plan helps FYE faculty see where students are struggling so that they can make changes and tweaks in their courses, and those students have improved. She stated that this has only be tried one semester University wide, but it has been encouraging to see where students came into FYE in terms of wellness, determine where they were lacking, and help them in areas where they were weak so that they improved by the end of the semester.

Parliamentarian Kaul asked how pass/fail correlates with the success or failure of a given program. He asked if FYE had a 100 percent pass rate if that would mean it was successful. He noted that FYE leadership looks at failure rates every semester, and he wonders if improvement in those rates translates to the success of the program in general. If this is the case, he wonders if it is also true of other courses, such as MATH 099; assuming MATH 099 has a 100 percent pass rate, is every student on the campus math literate. He also noted that if the survey is frequently modified there are no means of comparison with previous years. Senator Macchi pointed out that FYE has only used two surveys. The survey was changed in 2016-17 because when Dr. Cody initially gave FYE leadership the data he told them it was not a good instrument because it did not really get at the objectives and goals for the FYE program. After this feedback, a new survey was created in Fall 2016 to try to counteract the ineffective first survey in order to get better data to show whether the new iteration of FYE is working – to better show whether the courses are effective, if students are meeting the desired outcomes, and to what degree. Senator Macchi told senators that the first question on the new survey asks students to rank the topics in UNIV 100 from most helpful to least helpful. She added that the new survey also asks if their instructors aided in their success and how peer mentors factored into the course, so good data will be collected now whereas the original survey did not measure the goals of what FYE was trying to do.

Parliamentarian Kaul asked if it is fair to say that the University should be able to make some conclusions about the history of the last 13 years of the FYE program. He observed that it seems FYE leadership is unable to say what happened with the program over the past 13 years and is saying they will let faculty know how the program is going once several more years of data have been collected. Senator Macchi responded that this is not correct because the 2011 report that Chairperson Rock referenced shows results of the surveys for the first 10-11 years of the program. She said these results served as a spark to perform an entire review of FYE, which was begun six years ago. She stressed that the old program, whose results were reported in 2011 by professors David Lane and Russ Morgan, is very different than the new FYE program, which was revamped in Fall 2013, so the Program Evaluation Committee is looking at results from that date forward. Parliamentarian Kaul observed that Faculty Senate has not seen those results, and many senators and faculty are frustrated with FYE. Parliamentarian Kaul related that he was very involved at the beginning of FYE and takes it somewhat to heart that he cannot get an answer regarding whether the program is working as a whole or what parts of it are working. He stressed that it is frustrating to be told that FYE leadership collected data, changed a survey, and has done research studies, but nobody is able to provide an evaluation as to what has happened with FYE and whether it works. Senator Macchi thinks part of the problem is the message of how the first iteration of the FYE program ended in Summer 2013 and how it was changed, and that study may not have made its way to everyone. She stated that some people who are still involved in FYE teaching Y classes choose not to be involved in the program. Senator Macchi stated that Associate Provost Parsons has no control over department chairs that assign Y classes, and efforts to get everyone on the same page are extremely difficult. Senator Macchi related that she was also involved in FYE from Day 1 because she was hired to teach FYE courses. She concluded that the survey addressed all of the issues for the first 10-11 years of the program, and the reason why changes had to be made was because there were inconsistencies in the first iteration. She offered to provide that information to senators.

Motion: That there should be an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee to examine questions related to FYE (Allison/Hironimus-Wendt)

Senator Allison understands that there is already an FYE faculty committee that is looking at survey results, but she is concerned that when the FYE program was discussed at Faculty Senate in Fall 2017, senators asked questions related to the success of the program, and there was great push back on what that success means. She recalled that when senators asked whether FYE helps to retain students, there was push back stating that the program was never intended to retain students, while Faculty Senate insisted that it was. Senator Allison thinks that to rely on an FYE committee to tell Faculty Senate if the FYE program is a success is perhaps problematic when there is disagreement on what represents FYE success. Senator Macchi stated that the Program Evaluation Committee is not made up entirely of FYE faculty; it includes individuals from all around the campus, only one or two of whom teach UNIV 100 courses. She noted that Jeremy Robinett, who serves on it, teaches a Y course. Senator Macchi also thinks more clarity needs to be provided as to what is meant by success. She asked if this means success in retaining students because there is more to retention than FYE. She pointed out that retention is not included in the mission of FYE; FYE helps students transition to college, so hopefully those students will be retained, but there are outside factors affecting retention, such as financial considerations, over which FYE has no control.

Senator McIlvaine-Newsad suggested that it might be helpful to think of Senator Allison's proposal as similar to the process of external review for a program/discipline/major. She noted that it is often helpful to have people who are not so heavily involved and invested in a program take a look at the data with a new set of eyes. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad has been teaching Y classes for a long time and likes their smaller size, but she gets frustrated because, although it may be complex, she does not see the questions that she has asked being answered in a way that she can understand. She thinks this conversation may be able to be advanced by having a Faculty Senate committee conduct something similar to an external review.

Registrar Lynn stated that when looking at questions that FYE leadership are being asked to consider regarding success, there is no control group. She noted that students who complete UNIV 100 are being retained at a higher rate than those who withdraw or get an FN or FW grade, and that is no surprise because if students are not going to jump through UNIV 100 hoops they probably also will not trouble to jump through Math, English, and other hoops. She stressed that there is no control group that would allow one to say that UNIV 100 is or is not successful because everyone takes it. Dr. Lynn told senators that when they talk about UNIV 100 and Y failure rates and what is acceptable, they should also consider failure rates for the other courses freshmen take – ENG 100 and 180, MATH 099 and 100, PSY 100, and SOC 100 – and the UNIV 100 failure rate looks pretty good compared to those others. Dr. Lynn reported that the University receives accolades because WIU students perform well and retain at a higher level than what is expected for their incoming characteristics. She asked if this indicates that FYE is successful, and pointed out that it is difficult to pinpoint that type of thing.

Associate Provost Parsons stated that she is in favor of this ad hoc committee and strongly encourages senators to develop it. She agrees with Senator McIlvaine-Newsad that it could work like a program review. She informed senators that nearly all of the UNIV 100 instructors have their students complete the semester-end survey, but only 42 of the 60 Y faculty had their students complete it. She said that information is sent out at the beginning of the semester asking faculty to distribute the 35-question survey during their finals.

MOTION APPROVED 21 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB

Chairperson Rock suggested that the Executive Committee put together a proposal to bring back to the Senate.

Motion: To adjourn (Rahman)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Susan Czechowski, Faculty Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary