**WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY**
**FACULTY SENATE**
**Regular Meeting, *10 November 2015*, 4:00 p.m.**
**Capitol Rooms - University Union**

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

**SENATORS PRESENT:** M. Bean, S. Bennett, V. Boynton, J. Brown, A. Burke, G. Cabedo-Timmons, M. Carncross, D. DeVolder, K. Dodson, D. Halverson, R. Hironimus-Wendt, K. Kapale, C. Keist, N. Lino, J. McNabb, J. Myers, C. Pynes, T. Roberts, T. Sadler, B. Siever, A. Silberer, S. Szyjka
Ex-officio: Kathy Neumann, Interim Provost; Janna Deitz, Parliamentarian

**SENATORS ABSENT:** T. Westerhold

**GUESTS:** Dale Adkins, Rich Filipink, Angela Lynn, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Kyle Mayborn, Russ Morgan, Nancy Parsons, Jeremy Robinett, Steve Rock, Lora Wolff, Dan Yoder

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. 27 October 2015

**MINUTES APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED**

II. Announcements

A. Approvals from the President

1. Revision to Foreign Language/Global Issues Requirement (from currently requiring three semesters of university-level courses in a single language as one of the ways to complete the requirement to now allowing one semester of a foreign language to satisfy the requirement)

B. Provost's Report

**Motion:** To order the agenda to allow the Provost to speak when she arrives (McNabb/Brown)

**NO OBJECTIONS**

C. Student Government Association (SGA) Report
(Esmeralda Moreno, SGA student representative)

The Faculty Senate Chair spoke to SGA at its last meeting. SGA continues to make appointments of student representatives to various councils and committees.

D. Other Announcements

1. Higher Learning Commission Quality Improvement (QI) Project and Update on Task Forces
(Joe Rives, Vice President for Quad Cities and Planning)

Chairperson Pynes announced that Vice President Rives's visit has had to be postponed.

2. Faculty Senate is seeking petitions to fill a spring semester vacancy. The one-semester vacant seat is specified for a faculty member in the College of Arts and Sciences to replace Senator McNabb during her sabbatical. Petitions should be submitted to the Faculty Senate office by November 13. A petition form and election notice can be found on the

Faculty Senate website (http://www.wiu.edu/faculty_senate/elections.php) and have been provided to chairs in the College.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

A. Council on Admissions, Graduation, and Academic Standards (CAGAS)
(Steve Rock, Chair)

1. New FLGI Requirement Activation Date

Dr. Rock explained that there was some ambiguity when Faculty Senate approved changes to the Foreign Language/Global Issues (FLGI) requirement as to when they would be implemented. Under the revision, students can meet the FLGI requirement by taking one semester of a foreign language rather than the previous three semesters. Dr. Rock pointed out that there are two options: either the change is implemented fall 2016 and applies only to those students who matriculate under that catalog, or it could be implemented immediately and be effective for all currently enrolled students. The Registrar has indicated that nearly 100 current WIU students would meet the requirement if implemented immediately, and CAGAS is concerned about the number of potential requests for waivers if implementation is postponed until fall. Dr. Rock told senators that CAGAS believes it would be fairer to all students to implement the requirement immediately.

Chairperson Pynes informed senators that the Executive Committee discussed this two weeks ago, before the changes were approved by the President, and at that time recommended that the requirement be implemented in fall 2016 and not be made retroactive with the idea that those who could benefit from the change could appeal to CAGAS. Chairperson Pynes noted that approximately 1,800 students have not yet satisfied the FLGI requirement, so it would seem to be a good idea to accept the CAGAS recommendation.

Senator DeVolder asked if there is any advantage to making the change retroactive besides avoiding a possible avalanche of appeals to CAGAS. Chairperson Pynes replied that is the main argument he has been given. He noted that making the change effective immediately for all students would also avoid any possible confusion for advisors. According to the CAGAS report, advisors, along with the Registrar's and Admissions offices, have expressed their support of retroactive application of the newly-approved FLGI standard to all students.

Dr. Rock stated that there have been a number of instances in the past, including the Writing Exam, the Constitution Exam, and Writing Intensive courses, where Faculty Senate changed a policy and, in fairness, made the change effective for everyone immediately. Dr. Rock stressed that the question is one of fairness for students, and he thinks that WIU should treat all students, whether current or future, the same.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt also urged senators to accept the CAGAS report. He recalled that when Faculty Senate approved the change, it was in part because there was an unequal burden across departments; he believes that if the change is not made immediately for all current students, there will be an unequal burden across students. He hopes that Faculty Senate will approve CAGAS's recommendation in terms of fairness.

**NO OBJECTIONS TO CAGAS REPORT**

B. Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction (CCPI)
(Lora Wolff, Chair)

1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration

a) Request for New Course

(1) RPTA 367, Introduction to Meetings, Incentives, Conferences and Events, 3 s.h.

Senator Boynton remarked upon the abbreviated title, Intro to MICE. RPTA professor Jeremy Robinett explained that MICE is used as a common acronym in the field.

Senator Dodson remarked that HM 359, Legal Aspects in Hospitality Management, speaks to the legal issues involved in event planning, but the request for new course does not include a letter of support from the Chair of Dietetics, Fashion Merchandising, and Hospitality (DFMH). Dr. Robinett explained that RPTA 367 was developed as part of the Event Planning and Management minor. He added that HM 359 addresses legal issues in hospitality venues but not all of the venues dealt with in RPTA 367. He added that DFMH has been very involved in the creation of the courses for the minor. Senator Dodson pointed out that the Relationship to Courses in Other Departments section states, "There are no other courses that would provide an introduction to the philosophies and practices of the meeting, incentives, conferences and events industries as a whole," but HM 359 seems like it would address that in part. Dr. Robinette asserted that the scope of the two courses is different; RPTA 367 looks at the broader events industry across all formats, while HM 359 is focused on hospitality. Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if it would be helpful to have RPTA consult with DFMH and then bring the request back to Senate. Senator McNabb pointed out that consultation between the two departments has already occurred because DFMH Chair Mary Mhango signed off on the change to the interdisciplinary minor, which incorporates this course.

**NEW COURSE APPROVED**

b) Request for Change of Interdisciplinary Minor

(1) Event Planning and Management

**CHANGE OF MINOR APPROVED**

C. Committee on Provost and Presidential Performance (CPPP)
(Mahrya Carncross and Tim Roberts, Co-Chairs)

1. Revisions to Presidential Survey (Discussion Item)

Senator Roberts told senators that the survey under consideration is the product of many meetings to develop an evaluation for President Thomas this year; there will be no provost evaluation conducted. He stated that the Committee's overall goal this year is to increase faculty participation. CPPP members are trying to think carefully about ways to encourage faculty to see the survey as an important process in that any concerns that faculty articulate are taken seriously by the President. One change the Committee is recommending is to add the statement "The President will be invited to write a response to the evaluation, which will be posted to the Faculty Senate website, and to address the Senate."

Other changes recommended by the Committee include adding an area of evaluation on Student Success, adapted from an evaluation form supplied by Appalachian State, one of WIU's peer institutions, which it uses to evaluate its chancellor. Senator Roberts explained

that the intention is to evaluate ways in which the President works to shape, maintain, or improve the affordability of the University, which is a value that is discussed quite a bit at WIU. Senator Carncross explained that a question regarding how the President works with Student Services to foster policies for student quality of life was added in order to get at some of the other issues important to students, such as housing accommodations and things to do on and off campus. A new question on how the President promotes enhancement of student learning outcomes for a globally competitive environment was also adapted from the Appalachian State evaluation.

Senator Roberts pointed out that the "No Response" column on the bubblesheet has been changed to "No Basis for Response" in order to indicate why faculty may not evaluate the President. Senator Szyjka stated that "Does Not Apply" would be clearer in this column than "No Basis for Response" because some faculty may not interact at all with certain administrators so the question may not apply to them. He stated that while "No Basis for Response" is clearer than "No Response" because it provides more information, he believes that some statement indicating that the respondent does not interact with the person being evaluated would be better. Senator Roberts explained that CPPP intended "No Basis for Response" to be a way for faculty to indicate that they do not have sufficient interaction with the President to form a judgment on a particular question. He thinks "Does Not Apply" is a bit more unclear. Senator Brown, who also serves on CPPP, stated that, in looking at other surveys from peer institutions, there were a variety of phrases used for this category. He explained that CPPP thought it was important to change the heading because there is actually no response required to any question on the survey; respondents can leave any question blank, which shows "No Response," but "No Basis for Response" indicates that the faculty member has had limited interaction with the person being evaluated and may not have the information necessary to offer a response.

Chairperson Pynes chaired CPPP when the current version of the survey was created, and "No Response" was included to indicate a difference between not answering (or skipping) questions and those who did not want to answer a specific question. He related that at that time some faculty logged into the survey, answered a question or two, and then logged out, but the Committee was getting the same output for those unanswered questions as for those who might have completed the survey but chosen not to respond to a few questions. He stated that there are really three categories of non-response: those who do not want to answer a question, those who do not have a response to a question, and those who do not feel they have the basis to answer a question. Chairperson Pynes encouraged CPPP, if they wish to include "Does Not Apply," to also consider including "No Response" because it is important to differentiate between faculty not answering the question at all because they left it blank versus those faculty who choose not to answer a question.

Senator McNabb expressed her appreciation for the addition of questions that are student oriented. She does not, however, support removing "No Response" and replacing it with "No Basis for Response." She believes that "No Response" is an umbrella that can cover any number of reasons for not responding to a question, while "No Basis for Response" forces faculty to say they don't know enough to respond. She wants there to be a category for faculty who choose not to respond for such reasons as concerns regarding anonymity or retribution. Senator McNabb thinks faculty should have the opportunity to indicate that they do have opinions about a certain issue but are making a conscious decision not to respond.

Senator Carncross asked if there is any reason that the survey could not include both "No Response" and "Choose Not To Respond," followed by the rest of the Likert scale, or if that would be too confusing. She agrees that "No Response" acts as a kind of umbrella, but under that umbrella there could be "No Basis for Response" and "Choose Not to Respond," and she thinks the Committee would like to capture those distinctions.

Senator Szyjka suggested that if the entire first category is removed, faculty would have a forced choice of 1-5 on the Likert scale, and if the question was left blank that would count as a "No Response." Senator McNabb pointed out that, as Chairperson Pynes noted, that CPPP struggles to know why some faculty do not respond to particular questions – whether it is because they do not have enough information to respond or because they choose not to respond. She confirmed that if the category is removed then a faculty member who skips the question would be counted as a "No Response," but believes that if there are more specific options to offer faculty, it will result in a more valuable response. Senator Szyjka suggested that this might be accomplished by offering a place to explain the reason behind the choice not to complete a question; Senator McNabb pointed out that there are comment opportunities included throughout the document.

Senator Halverson likes the new "No Basis for Response" choice because it sends a different message to the President. He observed that multiple persons choosing this response might make the President wonder why individuals do not have enough information on a certain topic to respond and would send a message about making faculty aware of what the President is doing. While he is not saying that "No Basis for Response" should necessarily be the only choice for this column, Senator Halverson does want this choice included because of the message it sends.

Parliamentarian Deitz pointed out that there is a good reason why "Don't Know" or "No Response" appears on surveys because being able to measure non-attitudes provides information as well. She agrees with Senator Halverson that "No Basis for Response" can show there is a serious lack of information on campus about a particular issue. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that normally the Likert scale comes first and the "no answer" choice comes at the end so that respondents can decide first if they wish to answer and, if they do not, choose the "no response" choice at the far right of the scale.

Senator Boynton asked if the survey format limits the number of columns or if both "No Basis for Response" and "No Response" or "Does Not Apply" could be listed as the last two questions. Chairperson Pynes responded that another column could probably be added to the survey. Parliamentarian Deitz asked if the survey provided in Senate packets represents how it would appear to faculty or if the delineation between different levels would be clearer. Senator Roberts responded that the survey provided to senators is fairly crude compared to what respondents would see online.

Senator Roberts clarified that when someone does not respond to a question, it shows up as a "No Response." Chairperson Pynes added that this depends on how the survey administrator runs the data. He reiterated that when he chaired CPPP many years ago, both non-answers and those who chose "No Response" were reported as "No Response" answers, and the Committee wanted to be able to differentiate between those who clicked "No Response" and someone who answered five questions and then exited the survey.

Senator Bennett informed senators that when he chaired CPPP last year, dealing with the comments was the most difficult part of the survey. Like this year, the survey last year offered respondents an opportunity to provide comments for every section of the survey, but faculty seemed to use the first comment box to express everything that was on their minds. He related that when preparing the executive summary, he had to recategorize the comments in order to draw logical conclusions. Senator Bennett asked how CPPP would feel about having only one comment box. He suggested that one place for comments might make it easier for the Committee to organize; additionally, he believes that it is impossible not to quantify the quality of responses that are included on the survey, but having only one place to respond will prevent respondents from copying and pasting their negative responses in multiple comment boxes throughout the survey, which might lead to an overemphasis of which might only be one or two person's comments. Senator Carncross responded that this did not come up during the Committee's discussions but it is a good suggestion.

Senator Dodson, who also serves on CPPP this year, stated that if there is not a clear distinction between missing data and non-responses, that is an important factor to consider. Chairperson Pynes clarified that the Committee did change how the system works to address this past problem, which occurred only the first time he chaired CPPP. He suggested that the Committee might want to ask how three different categories of non-responses would be handled: if a question is left entirely blank, how would that data be reported back versus "No Response" and "No Basis for Response."

Senator DeVolder, who also chaired CPPP in the past, expressed his strong support for including both "No Basis for Response" and "Decline to Answer" in order to differentiate between a conscious choice not to answer versus the decision to leave a question blank. Senator McNabb stated that while she likes "No Basis for Response," she also wants faculty to have the liberty to express other sentiments, so she also is in favor of both versions of non-response.

Senator Myers commented last year that she would like to see feedback explaining why faculty should fill out the survey, and she is glad that has been included this year. She noted that CPPP has asked the Board of Trustees (BOT) for the current year's evaluation synopsis of the President, which raises the question of whether the Senate is evaluating the President on the same basis on which the BOT evaluates him. She wonders whether the questions that are utilized in the Senate's survey, to the extent that they are able, track what is being evaluated by the BOT, given that faculty will have a different perspective than that of Trustees. Senator Dodson responded that CPPP reviewed and discussed this in terms both of what the BOT evaluates and the President's responses on his website to the values that he identifies as those that he measures; CPPP looked for consistency between what the President identifies as his goals and the outcomes that he looks for annually. She added that CPPP also changed the survey to make it more consistent with the verbiage used by the President and cross-referenced that with aspects that the Board of Trustees is looking at as well. Senator Roberts confirmed that each category on the survey reflects, as far as CPPP can tell, what the BOT is working on. One change, to the category on Campus Collaboration, was made in response to this process.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt, who is serving on CPPP, agrees that it would be helpful to include both ways to indicate "no answer" to a particular question. He likes Senator DeVolder's language of "Decline to Answer" because it says explicitly that the respondent refuses to answer the question, and would like this added to the choice of "No Basis for Response," which implies that the respondent is in no position to tell how well the President addresses this question.

**Motion:** To add "Decline to Answer" to "No Basis for Response" as answer choices on the survey (Hironimus-Wendt/Myers)

Senator Roberts asked what CPPP should do if it is technically impossible to add an additional column. Chairperson Pynes responded that if the Committee is unable to add an additional column, it will not be able to implement the motion.

**MOTION APPROVED 22 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

Senator Keist suggested that if CPPP is unable to add another column, the Committee could consider removing the center column because then respondents are either forced to disagree or agree with the statement and cannot be neutral. Chairperson Pynes remarked that CPPP could consider removing the center column anyway in order to prevent respondents from being "on the fence." He remarked that one argument against eliminating the neutral column would be the difficulty of comparing responses with prior years, but CPPP may think it is more beneficial to have a forced choice rather than past year's comparisons.

Chairperson Pynes asked if the Committee has come to any conclusions about ways to increase faculty participation in the survey. Senator Roberts stated that CPPP thinks faculty will respond if they believe their voices are being heard and that it affords a way to communicate with the President. He stressed that faculty should be made aware that the BOT receives and uses the results of the faculty survey in their communications with the President. CPPP has considered having the BOT Chair write a letter to acknowledge the survey distribution and to demonstrate that the BOT is interested in what faculty have to say. The Committee also plans to invite President Thomas to respond officially, both in writing and in person before the Faculty Senate; the written response, which would be posted on the Faculty Senate website, would be for the benefit of those who do not attend the Senate meeting.

Chairperson Pynes noted that, having chaired CPPP twice, it is a lot of work putting the survey together, and Faculty Senate spends a lot of time on it, so senators should encourage their colleagues to participate both for themselves and for the benefit of the BOT. He suggested that perhaps a shorter survey might, in many respects, give Faculty Senate better results. He stated that if senators have other ideas on ways to increase faculty participation, they should speak now or convey those ideas to members of the CPPP.

Senator Szyjka suggested that a couple more reassurances about anonymity might be beneficial. Chairperson Pynes noted that survey responses are actually not anonymous; they are confidential. Senator Szyjka asked if that means there is a way to determine which response came from which respondent. Chairperson Pynes explained while the President would be unable to determine this, somebody could do it, but it would be extremely difficult. He added that while it is not strictly accurate to say the survey is anonymous, it is seriously confidential, and the President and Provost do not have access to the data. Senator Szyjka reiterated that there may be concern in the backs of faculty member's minds about whether negative comments can be traced back to them.

Senator Brown remarked that CPPP spent a lot of time at its first meeting discussing the response rate, and the topic of anonymity was brought up. He informed senators that in the last survey, about half of the faculty who received the email did not open it. CPPP has considered offering faculty the option of completing a paper survey if they are concerned about anonymity. Senator Brown related that at the last Executive Committee meeting, Chairperson Pynes suggested the idea of sending the survey electronically but offering scantron sheets to record responses. Senator Brown would be interested in other ideas regarding offering a paper option or how the two options could be combined.

Chairperson Pynes observed that greater faculty input is good for both the President and the BOT. He believes there are ways that the survey could be run anonymously through the Faculty Senate office, as was done in the past, so that is something that could be considered if Faculty Senate thinks it would be worthwhile; for instance, respondents could be asked to submit comments anonymously to the Senate office in pre-addressed envelopes. Chairperson Pynes stressed that the Senate and CPPP do not have to continue facilitating the survey the same way every year just because it has always been done a certain way.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt thinks the fear of being "outed" by the President and punished for responding to a survey is an interesting idea. He has never heard of a President outing a professor for saying something on a survey; he does not think the President and Provost care to go into the data to determine who said what and believes that such an idea is mere silliness. Senator Hironimus-Wendt pointed out that no survey can really be called anonymous because in the final analysis the Department of Homeland Security could find out what anyone responds to a survey if they wanted to, but he does not think that faculty should assume that the President and Provost would act maliciously and use it as a justification for not responding to a survey. Senator Hironimus-Wendt thinks that the

burden should be on those responding to the survey rather than on the Senate to keep coming up with ways to make sure the survey is confidential and anonymous when there is already a good system in place. He pointed out that no administrator has gone through the survey data in ten years, and no one has ever been retaliated against because of their responses. He believes that senators should tell faculty to stop fearing being outed rather than trying to figure out more intense ways to deliver this survey.

Senator Dodson asked whether the suggestion is to include some sort of language to make explicit to individuals that the President will not preview the raw data. Senator Dodson wants to know when filling out surveys that there will be no backlash or repercussions and told senators she was the "nay-sayer" on CPPP when this topic was discussed. She thinks that if the survey states explicitly that the President/Provost would not have access to the raw data, it would help allay fears.

Chairperson Pynes pointed out that America employs secret ballots for its elections, not because of fear of retaliation but because Americans just do not want people to know how they vote sometimes or who they like/dislike. He believes that part of the job of the Senate is to get as many faculty involved as possible in the evaluation process, and if senators can do that in a way that is not onerous, he thinks it should be considered.

Senator Szyjka observed that there are many contributing factors as to what makes a person ultimately complete a survey, whether fears for anonymity, a preference for paper surveys, or just the inconvenience of completing it. He believes that, as leaders of the University community, senators have a responsibility to encourage their constituents to complete the evaluation, and this encouragement may, coupled with other efforts discussed, lead to an increase in the response rate and enable some determination of which factors contributed to the increase. He noted that response rates to surveys are typically 30 percent, which with approximately 600 faculty comes to 180. He believes senators should try to increase that rate to 35 or 40 percent. He thinks a 50 percent response rate would be astonishing, but could possibly be done.

Senator Bennett clarified that the President does receive all comments, while Faculty Senate sees a selection of the comments in the executive summary. He observed that some people write very unprofessional remarks, and President Thomas's first concern is that he see all of those comments. Chairperson Pynes added that the Provost sees only the Provost's report; the President sees both his own report and the Provost's report; and the Board of Trustees receives the President's report.

Senator McNabb contests that the Senate has established a successful survey system if half of those receiving the email do not choose to open it. She thinks this dismaying statistic is because faculty "know what they are getting into" when they open the email. She believes it would be useful to develop a streamlined survey, although even that may not turn the tide because faculty know what is in the email confronting them and they think it is too much of an investment of time. Senator McNabb related that her department utilizes a double-blind envelope for its chair evaluations, which offers a different kind of confidentiality/anonymity factor because it truly divorces the respondent from his/her identity. She suspects that confronting faculty with something as old fashioned as a paper survey may result in a better yield and a feeling of efficacy for the time investment. Senator McNabb also thinks faculty look at the online survey and imagine that their response has gone into the ether, but they don't see any measurable impact. She likes the idea of offering the BOT the opportunity to reflect on what this data means to them, how it changes their relationship with the President or their sense of the WIU community, and she thinks this might make faculty take notice and respond. Chairperson Pynes added that he emailed BOT Chair Clauson on October 19 with a request for input but has not yet received a response.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt pointed out that CPPP strongly encourages the President to respond to the survey this year, which will be hosted on the Faculty Senate website to show that the President is reading the results. He hopes this will provide faculty with more of a sense of ownership.

Senator Dodson pointed out that this year's survey has 69 questions, including text response options. Her students recently completed a survey with twice as many questions and it took them 15 minutes, so she does not think the number of questions should be overly cumbersome for anyone. In regard to Senator Bennett's suggestion regarding replacing the text boxes with one suggestion box at the end, Senator Dodson stated that she likes the idea of having text boxes in separate places throughout the survey because she makes comments in different sections and finds it helpful to make sure that she does not miss anything in any section.

Senator Roberts asked, if senators think that additional confidentiality language is needed, whether it should be included with the narrative in page 1. Chairperson Pynes recommended that CPPP insert the statement where they deem appropriate, and if senators disagree they can bring that up when the revised survey is returned to Senate. Senator Brown expressed his agreement with Senator Hironimus-Wendt that confidentiality should not be a great concern of faculty, but he acknowledged that there are some who have expressed that in the past. He is not sure, however, that an additional statement will reassure faculty who are suspicious or doubtful of the survey's confidentiality. Senator Carncross suggested that perhaps additional information about how data will be handled – such as that responses will not be linked numerically to names – might help a bit, but she thinks that is about all that the Committee can do to allay fears. She suggested such a statement be as specific as possible and also offer the option for faculty to take the survey on paper if they have concerns about electronic delivery.

II. Announcements

B. Provost's Report *(Reordered)*

Interim Provost Neumann reported that there was a good discussion at the first town hall meeting for the College of Fine Arts and Communication which resulted in lots of good suggestions. She stated that town hall meetings for the other three academic colleges and University Libraries will occur before the end of the semester. She asked senators to encourage their colleagues to attend.

Interim Provost Neumann and Associate Provost Nancy Parsons are going through program reviews this week and early next week.

President Thomas is in Springfield today testifying before the full House of Representatives. Interim Provost Neumann stated that President Thomas, along with two other university presidents and two community college presidents, is trying to make legislators aware that the current budget situation is not benefitting anyone and the state needs to get past this impasse.

Senator Roberts recalled that at the last Senate meeting Interim Provost Neumann discussed the possibility of tuition reductions to encourage enrollment. He asked if there is any more information on this topic. Interim Provost Neumann responded that no change will be implemented for the spring semester; fall 2016 would be the soonest any change would occur. She reported that Bill Polley, Interim Associate Dean for the College of Business and Technology, has been able to provide some preliminary feedback from his evaluation of Student Clearinghouse data but needs to complete more scrubbing. She thinks there will be some good information resulting from this process.

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

D. Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)

(Virginia Boynton, Chair)

**UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES:**

Search Committee for Associate Provost for Budget, Planning and Personnel
Richard Hughey, Music

**Motion:** To nominate Rich Filipink, History (Roberts)

Since Dr. Hughey was not present to make a statement, Chairperson Pynes asked SNC members to address why they chose to nominate him. Senator Burke, who serves on SNC, confirmed that Dr. Hughey was recommended for nomination by the full Committee and was very enthusiastic to serve. Senator McNabb asked if Dr. Hughey had also completed the SNC annual survey indicating his interest in serving on search committees; Senator Burke confirmed that he did. Senator Dodson, who also serves on SNC, added that Dr. Hughey indicated he has previously served in this capacity.

Senator Roberts was asked why he nominated Dr. Filipink. Dr. Roberts observed that, as a University Professionals of Illinois representative of the faculty, Dr. Filipink will come into contact with the person elected to the Associate Provost position, so it would be a good fit for him to be part of the process of selecting that individual.

Paper ballots were distributed and then counted by the Parliamentarian and Recording Secretary. Dr. Hughey was elected to serve on the search committee. Chairperson Pynes thanked the Senate Nominating Committee for their efforts and Dr. Filipink for his willingness to serve.

IV. Old Business – None

V. New Business – None

**Motion:** To adjourn (McNabb)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Jeff Brown, Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary