

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Regular Meeting, 1 December 2015, 4:00 p.m.
Capitol Rooms - University Union

ACTION MINUTES

SENATORS PRESENT: M. Bean, S. Bennett, V. Boynton, J. Brown, A. Burke, G. Cabedo-Timmons, D. DeVolder, K. Dodson, 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, T. Westerhold
Ex-officio: Kathy Neumann, Interim Provost; Janna Deitz, Parliamentarian

SENATORS ABSENT: M. Carncross, D. Halverson

GUESTS: Dale Adkins, Wil Gradle, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Kyle Mayborn, Russ Morgan, Nancy Parsons, Gary Schmidt, Sam Thompson, Lora Wolff

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. November 10 2015

MINUTES APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED

II. Announcements

A. Approvals from the President

1. To make recent changes to the Foreign Language/Global Issues requirement effective immediately for all currently enrolled students

B. Provost's Report

Interim Provost Neumann told senators that the town hall meetings that she has been attending with President Thomas will be completed next week. An announcement will come out soon finalizing the date for the President's State of the University address, during which Interim Provost Neumann stated that many things should be solidified.

C. Student Government Association (SGA) Report
(Wil Gradle, SGA President)

Mr. Gradle reported that SGA recommends that the criteria by which signature programs are selected be changed to one based upon the program's uniqueness in the state of Illinois or recognized because the program is ranked or widely acknowledged for its quality. SGA has suggested that certain programs be considered for inclusion: Physics, Political Science, Emergency Management, Paleontology, Fire Science, Interdisciplinary Studies Renewable Energy, and Communication Sciences and Disorders.

SGA also observed that transfer students are not offered four-year graduation guarantees – two years at a community college and two years at WIU – as are incoming freshmen and is looking at other state universities to see how they approach this issue. SGA also discussed the fact that there is a disparity between the levels of Western Commitment scholarships offered to transfer students and those for incoming freshmen.

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 to January 26 due to a delay in his incoming flight.

2. Biennial Reapportionment

Eligible faculty, as defined in the Senate Constitution, are counted every other year, with one senator assigned for every 40 faculty members in a college. Chairperson Pynes explained that even though the numbers of faculty in the colleges changed this year, it did not affect the assignment of senators per college (six for Arts and Sciences, three for Business and Technology, four for Education and Human Services, and three for Fine Arts and Communication).

3. Ballots have been mailed to eligible faculty to fill a spring semester vacancy on Faculty Senate to represent the College of Arts and Sciences to replace Senator McNabb during her sabbatical. Ballots are due to be returned by December 8.
4. The deadline for petitions to fill a spring semester vacancy on the University Personnel Committee from the College of Business and Technology has been extended to Friday since no petitions were received by the deadline last week.
5. An election is being held to constitute an Academic Program Elimination Review (APER) Committee. According to Article 26 of the UPI contract, "When the University is considering eliminating academic programs that would result in the layoff of an employee, it will constitute an Academic Program Elimination Review (APER) Committee composed of and elected by employees in the bargaining unit. The sole purpose of the APER Committee shall be to provide recommendations to the Academic Vice President concerning academic programs being considered for elimination which would result in the layoff of an employee." The APER Committee reviews program costs and enrollment history, contributions of the program to the general education requirements, interdisciplinary and service functions, graduation requirements, the University curriculum, and contributions of the program to the mission and goals of WIU before making its recommendations.

The APER Committee shall 1) have no more than five members, 2) have representation from each college and the Library, 3) have a term of appointment "appropriate to the anticipated workload," and 4) be elected in an election conducted by the Faculty Senate.

Only faculty from Unit A will be allowed to run for election or to sign petitions. The term of service will be for two years. Faculty from the four academic colleges will be asked to get ten signatures on their petitions, while Library faculty will be asked to get five signatures from their area. Signatures must be obtained only from Unit A faculty employed in the area that the member will represent on the Committee.

The election notice for the Committee will be sent to Unit A faculty via email on Thursday, November 19 along with a petition form. Faculty will have until noon on Friday, December 4 to submit petitions. Ballots will be sent out for contested elections on Monday, December 7, with ballots due by Friday, December 18.

6. Chairperson Pynes acknowledged that this will be the last Faculty Senate meeting for Senator Matt Bean, who has been filling in for Brian Locke, Music, during his fall sabbatical and thanked him for his service.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

A. Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction (CCPI)

(Lora Wolff, Chair)

1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Geography

a) Request for Change of Minor

(1) Meteorology

CHANGE OF MINOR APPROVED

b) Request for Change of Major

(1) Meteorology

CHANGE OF MAJOR APPROVED

B. Committee for International Education (CIE)

(Gary Schmidt, Chair)

1. Global Issues Review Process

Dr. Schmidt told senators that the Council for International Education (CIE) has been entrusted with two tasks: the review of courses for initial Global Issues (GI) designation, and the review of previously-approved GI courses to ensure that they continue to fulfill their goals and objectives. CIE started finalizing the review procedure a few years ago. The Council proposes a five-year rotation; once a new GI course is approved, it would not come up for review for five years. He added that 30 GI courses were approved prior to August 2010.

Dr. Schmidt hopes to send a memo to chairs in January and request a response by March addressing courses approved prior to August 2010. He said that CIE wanted to create a streamlined process whereby chairs would simply fill in a few sentences for each course stating how they are continuing to meet all three Global Issues goals and two of the six Global Issues objectives. A syllabus should also be submitted for each course.

Senator McNabb asked how the data will be reviewed by CIE. She commended the council on seeking quality feedback now that the Foreign Language/Global Issues (FLGI) requirement has been around for awhile. Senator McNabb recalled that when she participated in reviews as former chair of the Writing Instruction in the Disciplines (WID) Committee, there were good conversations with the faculty teaching those courses; it became an educational moment for the Committee as well as for the faculty and the chair, who were both present. She observed, however, that the review process proposed by CIE seems rather sterile without much human interaction. She asked if CIE plans a series of follow-up meetings and what is being done on the assessment side once the data is received. Dr. Schmidt pointed out that the Council is not empowered to conduct assessment such as is done by the Provost's office, but will only conduct course reviews. He promised to take under advisement the recommendation that follow-up meetings be held with departments and/or faculty members. He said that while this seems to be a good idea, it is not something that CIE discussed, but he promised to bring the suggestion before the Council.

Senator McNabb stated that when she chaired the WID Committee, courses were reviewed in a rotation, department by department, so that members were not facing a mountain of courses at once; a series of departments was targeted to review in successive semesters or years. She suggested that such a schedule might make departments with GI courses more responsible to the goals that are attached to them. She said the review process allowed WID Committee members to determine individual visions and philosophies of the faculty

teaching the courses and how those philosophies were being put into practice. Senator McNabb does not think that syllabi can really communicate what is happening in classrooms and how students are responding to the material. She stated that a review process such as she described does represent a massive time commitment, but she found it worthwhile completing those types of exercises while on the WID Committee.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked how a GI designation can be removed from a class once it is approved. Interim Provost Neumann responded that an email from the department chair to the Provost's office is all that is necessary to remove a designation for a GI, Gen Ed, or WID course.

Senator Myers asked if CIE has developed any type of scale so that departments can indicate what percentage of time will be devoted to addressing goals 1, 2, or 3 of a Global Issues course. She recalled that previous conversations had mentioned that some GI courses, such as those in Music and Theatre, seem not to devote much time to the GI part of the course, so she wonders if CIE will try to determine how integral Global Issues is to the entire course. Dr. Schmidt responded that, based on his participation in CIE, the courses that have been approved devote more than one or two lectures to Global Issues topics; Global Issues are an integral and majority part of the course content. He thinks it would be difficult to put together a successful application for GI designation if that were not the case. He has never heard CIE discuss this, however, in terms of a specific numerical percentage. Senator Bean stated that he surmises that GI courses in Music and Theatre only devote about two percent of their content to GI topics and 98 percent to the actual focus of the courses. He believes that whoever fills out the form may paint a skewed vision of what the course is accomplishing. He asked where the teeth will be in the CIE review process. Dr. Schmidt responded this is a good question. He pointed out that since CIE is requesting copies of syllabi for GI courses, a comparison between the current syllabus and what was originally submitted for the GI course should make it clear if a minimal part of the content includes topics of global issues. He noted that since CIE is at the beginning of the process, they will have to develop some strategies as they go along, but in the case of such a disconnect he imagines that CIE would at that time need to discuss whether the course should continue to have GI designation or be revised to bring it more in line with the goals and objectives.

Senator Boynton related that when she served on the Council on General Education they were told that they did not have the power to remove Gen Ed designation, even if the Council did not think the course belonged in Gen Ed any longer. She asked if CIE would have the authority to remove GI designation. Associate Provost Parsons stated that when new courses are submitted to CCPI, they have course objectives assigned to them, and if these objectives significantly change, a request for change should be submitted to CCPI for the course. She expressed concerns that objectives related to Global Issues may not be in line with the objectives originally submitted for these courses. Dr. Schmidt remarked that since Global Issues designation often occurs after the initial creation of a course, this type of disconnect could very well occur. He added that these are things that may come to light as CIE conducts its initial reviews of these courses. Dr. Schmidt expressed his pleasure at hearing the questions being raised because CIE members had been concerned that the Council would be viewed as overstepping its bounds. Dr. Schmidt observed that, instead, he is hearing that Faculty Senate would like for CIE to take this review very seriously, and he plans to take that message back to the Council.

Senator McNabb noted that if multiple faculty members are teaching the same course, CIE will likely get a collection of syllabi, which provides another recommendation for having face-to-face meetings with the faculty teaching GI courses so that everyone can get on the same page. She believes faculty want to know how they can do better, and if a faculty member inherited a course with a GI designation, they may not understand the importance of meeting the GI goals and objectives. She believes face-to-face reviews provide a great opportunity to discuss the goals and visions for the course and ways to engage students in

considering this important information. Senator McNabb recommends making the CIE review process as interactive and responsive as possible because it provides a good opportunity to educate faculty teaching these courses.

Senator Boynton noted that students can take one GI course to satisfy the Foreign Language/Global Issues requirement, and that course must meet only two of the six Global Issues objectives. She asked if there are certain of those objectives that most GI courses have chosen to meet and others that none of the courses meet. Dr. Schmidt responded that CIE has never evaluated that. His understanding is that this criterion was included in the original requirement language.

Senator Roberts asked whether a department is immediately eligible to resubmit a course for GI designation after revision if CIE decides that the course no longer meets the GI criteria. Dr. Schmidt responded that it would seem to make sense to allow revision to occur after discussions with CIE, but the Council does not know if it can remove GI designation, and that course of action would not seem to be productive. Chairperson Pynes confirmed that the CIE review would not mean that a course would lose its GI status. Associate Provost Parsons added when new courses are presented to CCPI, the objectives included in the request are intended to apply to every section of the course that is taught. She reiterated that if the structure of a previously-approved course changes, the change must be submitted to CCPI.

Chairperson Pynes observed that he thinks it is interesting that now that Faculty Senate has voted to allow courses to transfer in as Global Issues, similar to the IAI process for Gen Ed courses, the University has no oversight over the content of those courses. He remarked that having these types of conversations department-wide allows everyone to be on the same page about what is important for Global Issues and allows those that teach GI courses to understand the genuine value of this particular requirement. He believes there are legitimate concerns about allowing courses to transfer in as GI because, unlike with IAI articulation, the University has no control and the courses could have been taught with a different emphasis at other institutions. He thinks the review process will allow departments to articulate what is important about how they teach GI courses individually.

Senator McNabb remarked that the WID Committee used to issue final reports after their reviews and make suggestions to departments; for instance, if there were areas of non-compliance, the WID Committee suggested how they could become compliant again. The Committee did not have the power to strike the WID designation, but could make recommendations. Senator McNabb suggested that CIE consider a one- to two-page report to chairs and faculty teaching GI courses following their reviews to integrate what departments are doing well and make recommendations for improvement. She stated that the WID Committee did approximately five reviews per semester and used it as an opportunity to offer advice on best practices. She sees this process more as operationalizing GI goals and objectives rather than changing the courses. She stressed that CIE has a repository of knowledge that needs to be shared. She also suggested that CIE could consider proposing to Faculty Senate a probationary period for courses if a department does not take the GI designation with the seriousness that Faculty Senate intends.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that if the CIE proposal for “a five-year rotation for approval” is put in place, it appears that “teeth” is being put into this process because it seems to be saying that after five years, a GI course needs to be approved again, and if it does not pass the review, then it is not approved. Chairperson Pynes stressed that the curricular process does not work that way; once a course receives a designation, it can keep that designation unless the chair sends a note to the Provost’s office requesting that it be removed. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that he would like to see CIE structure the review more toward the model that courses would need to seek reapproval after five years. Chairperson Pynes asserted that when departments create courses, they do so in good faith,

and making more hoops for departments and faculty to jump through may not be a best practice. He added that a review process, such as is proposed by CIE, can help courses to stay on track, which is also the desire of faculty. He does not think that Faculty Senate should be recertifying courses every five years because, if it becomes the practice for GI courses, recertification might have to be done for Gen Ed and WID courses as well.

Senator McNabb stated that she imagines the annual report presented by CIE at the beginning of the fall semester will include results from the reviews, so that can serve as a public record and provide a little informal shaming if courses are found to be substandard. She noted that a similar process is done with WID overenrolled courses which are reported to Senate every semester. She recommends seeing how the compliance issue works out first without overburdening CIE with constantly recertifying courses, which would become a full-time job given the number of GI courses at the University. Senator Boynton suggested that information about courses that are non-compliant could also be shared with deans in order to provide a bit more incentive for improvement.

NO OBJECTIONS TO THE REPORT

IV. Old Business

A. Committee on Provost and Presidential Performance (CPPP) (Tim Roberts, Co-Chair)

1. Revisions to Presidential Survey

Senator Roberts related that David Towers, who administers surveys on behalf of the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (CITR), visited with the Committee to discuss issues of confidentiality. CPPP has developed confidentiality language to accompany the survey:

The WIU faculty survey is an ‘invited survey,’ meaning the survey software is provided with a list of faculty names and email addresses. This list is used to send an email with an invitation to take the survey and a link that is unique to the individual. An option is set to remove all identifying information other than, by email address, who sent the survey, who started it, and who completed it. In this way, a respondent’s answers are not paired with her/his name, email address, or the IP address of the computer used to take the survey.

Senator Roberts hopes that this statement will help to alleviate faculty’s concerns about the confidentiality and security of their answers. He added that it would be very difficult to trace a faculty member’s responses back to that individual.

Based on feedback from the last Senate meeting, CPPP added a column for “Decline to Respond,” and put it, along with the column for “No Basis for Response,” as the last two choices rather than the first two choices. CPPP asks senators to encourage participation in their departments and hopes that the Board of Trustees (BOT) provides a letter to accompany the survey explaining its importance to the Board. Chairperson Pynes will see the BOT Chair on December 18 and reiterate his request for this letter.

Senator McNabb asked if the statement “The estimated time to complete the survey is 15 minutes,” is a new addition to the survey. Senator Roberts responded this was included on last year’s survey. Senator McNabb likes that this statement appears at the beginning so that faculty have an indication of whether or not to start the survey or put it off until they have more time. Chairperson Pynes noted that the survey includes 69 questions, so 15 minutes seems like it would be ideal rather than the time of someone who reads slower or has more comments to make. Senator Dodson remarked that CPPP considered changing this to 15 to 20 minutes. Senator Keist does not think that most faculty could respond to 69

questions efficiently in a 15-minute timeframe. Senator Dodson stated that when asking someone to take a survey, it is in the interest of full disclosure to tell them what is expected and how much time will be involved. She does not think stating 15 to 20 minutes would discourage anyone from taking the survey, and they may be more inclined to take it if they think it is not overly laborious. Senator DeVolder believes that 15 minutes is probably optimistic, and suggested CPPP consider extending that time estimate.

Senator Boynton suggested that in the email accompanying the survey faculty be informed that they have the option to choose “Decline to Respond” or “No Basis for Response” for each question, as well as mentioning the confidentiality reminder. Senator Boynton also asked if there should be a “Decline to Respond” option appended to the demographic section. She noted that the number of faculty who have been at WIU 20 years or more may be few in some colleges, which, taken in addition to gender and other responses, could narrow down the identity of the respondent. Chairperson Pynes stated that he does not think the Committee receives the demographic information, and he is not sure why it is included in the survey. Senator Hironimus-Wendt remarked that if faculty choose not to answer any part of the survey, it shows as “missing data.” He does not recall seeing information from the demographic section in previous reports except for a percentage of responses by college; he has not seen the number of responses broken down by male/female or age, but he is not sure if the information is relevant or irrelevant. Senator Keist asked why CPPP is collecting information on sex or age if it is not being used. Senator Bennett, who chaired CPPP last year, stated that Dr. Towers ran a number of correlations with the data. Senator Roberts suggested that the demographic information be retained this year with the recommendation that CPPP next year consider whether this section should be eliminated.

NO OBJECTIONS TO THE SURVEY

V. New Business

Chairperson Pynes encouraged senators to talk to their colleagues about the Faculty Initiatives Program, adding that some good things have come out of this process in the past.

Chairperson Pynes asked if senators have any concerns that have not been expressed up to this point or wish to discuss things that might have come up in the Executive Committee minutes or elsewhere. He stated that ExCo is still working on an issue brought up by Senator Hironimus-Wendt on the service of chairs on Faculty Senate. Chairperson Pynes believes this is an interesting question for a number of reasons, one of which is that a chair could serve on Senate but cannot sign petitions, vote for members, or serve on the Academic Program Elimination Review Committee, which is restricted to faculty in bargaining Unit A.

Chairperson Pynes informed senators that the Executive Committee in the spring will discuss the process of Faculty Senate reapportionment. Currently, seven at-large seats (one specifically for WIUQC) are written into the Constitution; however, the number of college representatives can change based upon the number of eligible faculty members. He noted that college sizes may change if departments move or are merged, which can change the actual size of the Senate even though the number of faculty at-large remains the same. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that one college could dominate the at-large seats, leading to over representation on Faculty Senate even though at-large senators are intended to represent all faculty at WIU. Chairperson Pynes thinks Faculty Senate should consider whether at-large faculty should be a percentage of total seats on Faculty Senate and whether Senate should have a fixed number of seats, adding that other senates across the state approach the assignment of seats as a percentage. He pointed out that some faculty might think that the College of Arts and Sciences is currently overrepresented on the Senate since they dominate at-large and have the most assigned seats. If any change is made in the way representation is determined, it would require a vote of all eligible faculty at the University. Chairperson Pynes credited Parliamentarian Deitz with the analysis of the Senate’s composition, and stated that the Executive Committee will bring forward a recommendation on this issue at a future date.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that this is his third time serving as a senator, and he has always run at-large because he perceives himself as representing the entire faculty rather than his college. He thinks there are good arguments for and against changing the way representation is determined but stressed that at-large senators must recognize that they serve the faculty as a whole.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if there is any reason why the Faculty Senate agenda does not include an item “For the Good of the Order,” which is included in *Robert’s Rules of Order*. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that the Faculty Senate follows the *Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*. Parliamentarian Deitz confirmed that Faculty Senate has never used the agenda item “For the Good of the Order” to her knowledge. Senator Hironimus-Wendt pointed out that many parliamentary bodies use “For the Good of the Order” at the end of the meeting for these types of discussions. Chairperson Pynes stated that Faculty Senate uses the New Business agenda item as a place where senators can bring up issues and items of new business. Senator Hironimus-Wendt responded that these types of discussions are not strictly “New Business.” He prefers “For the Good of the Order,” to close meetings “on a good point.”

Senator Boynton observed that the size of Congress is fixed, and she had not realized that Western’s Faculty Senate was not similarly of a fixed size. Parliamentarian Deitz explained that Faculty Senate is required during fall of every odd year to determine reapportionment; if contraction occurred in the size of a college, there could be a situation where assignment of the at-large seats would lead to malapportionment, where one college would have a greater voice than would be perceived if the members were all representatives of their colleges. She stated that this would be less of an issue if the Senate were to grow, but could become an issue if it contracts because WIU’s Faculty Senate does not take a seat from one college and give it to another, which is part of the problem. She added that the other part of the problem is that at-large seats are not determined on a proportionality basis. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that if at-large seats were determined by a percentage, future reductions could be taken from the at-large seats rather than from an individual college. Parliamentarian Deitz pointed out that currently at-large representation is fixed, but the total size of the Senate is not.

Senator Boynton asked if the size of the Senate has changed much in the past ten to 20 years. The Senate Recording Secretary responded that the size of the Senate changed two years ago after reapportionment when the College of Arts and Sciences lost a seat and the College of Fine Arts and Communication gained a seat. Senator Boynton asked if the current size of the Senate (23 senators) is optimal. Chairperson Pynes responded that he has asked Parliamentarian Deitz to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee at its next meeting since this is her area of expertise.

Senator Roberts asked if the Executive Committee sent a letter to legislators on behalf of Faculty Senate expressing concerns about the lack of a state budget, as senates at some other universities have done. Chairperson Pynes related that the Executive Committee discussed sending a resolution to legislators but questioned whether it would have any impact. Senator Brown added that ExCo ultimately decided that sending such a resolution would represent largely a symbolic gesture. Chairperson Pynes, on behalf of the Executive Committee, offered to draft such a letter if senators wish him to do so, but he does not think it would be particularly useful. He added that at the recent Council for Illinois University Senates that he attended, two state universities indicated that they sent resolutions to state legislators; they offered to share their resolutions with other senate chairs, but Chairperson Pynes has not received them.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt observed that an important person who was very connected to higher education and devoted to Western Illinois University died this week. He told senators that Bill Griffin served on the Board of Trustees, as a Geography professor, and helped found the Illinois Institute for Rural Affairs. A celebration of Dr. Griffin’s life will be held at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, December 3, at the Macomb Country Club.

Chairperson Pynes announced that state legislators are discussing accepting scores of “3” as well as “4” and “5” on AP tests. He offered to prepare draft language for senators to review if Faculty Senate wants the Executive Committee to send a response to legislators or express the opposition of the faculty to this change. Senator Boynton stated that Senator McNabb runs the AP Euro exam nationally and asked her

what a score of “3” means. Senator McNabb responded that scores of “4” and “5” represent truly excellent exams that are parallel with the college level. Chairperson Pynes asked if accepting a score of “3” concerns Senator McNabb, and she responded that it does. Senator Bennett related that there was a physical sciences panel just prior to Thanksgiving break, and it is his understanding that the decision has already been made to allow scores of “3” on AP tests. He said word from the panel was that departments need to realign their course descriptions to explain how this change will be implemented. He added that the University of Illinois convinced the panel to allow universities to give elective credit for “3” scores, not equal to the course credit that would be achieved by a score of “4” or “5.” Associate Provost Parsons related that this was also discussed at the Illinois Board of Higher Education Academic Leadership meeting; some there stated that scores of “4” and “5” would count toward majors while “3” scores would only count for general education or electives. Senator Roberts observed that he was involved last summer with an interdisciplinary AP seminar course that is hard to fit into any one department. He believes it is a very good prep AP course for all kinds of critical thinking and writing. He added that if WIU were to offer credit for this course and encourage students to apply for it, it would position the University on the cutting edge since this is very new. Chairperson Pynes asked senators to keep in mind that faculty may need to determine ways to deal with the issue of allowing “3” scores for AP tests.

Motion: To adjourn (McNabb)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Jeff Brown, Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary