

**WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Regular Meeting, 20 February 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, J. Franken, R. Hironimus-Wendt, A. Hyde (via teleconference), N. Lino, B. Locke, S. Macchi H. McIlvaine-Newsad, B. Perabo, J. Plos, R. Porter (via teleconference), S. Rahman, T. Roberts, S. Rock, S. Saddler, M. Sajewski, D. Sandage, C. Tarrant, F. Tasdan
Ex-officio: Kathy Neumann, Interim Provost; Tej Kaul, Parliamentarian

SENATORS ABSENT: S. Czechowski, K. Pawelko

GUESTS: Dennis DeVolder, Justin Ehrlich, Anita Hardeman, Tammy Killian, Angela Lynn, Madison Lynn, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Seth Miner, Greg Montalvo, Russ Morgan, Nancy Parsons, Rebecca Slater, Jenna Wilkerson, Ron Williams, Andy Woerly

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. February 6, 2018

MINUTES APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED

II. Announcements

A. Approvals from the Provost

1. Requests for New Courses

- a. FL 121, Less Commonly Taught Languages I, 3 s.h.
- b. FL 122, Less Commonly Taught Languages II, 3 s.h.

B. Provost's Report

- Interim Provost Neumann reported that a lot of good suggestions and comments were made at the recent Town Hall meeting with the President. The Town Hall meeting was held Monday, February 19 and focused on the positive events taking place at WIU and working together to promote the University and tell the WIU story.
- Interim Provost Neumann extended her congratulations to everyone involved with the Pre-Med Symposium, which provided a good opportunity for students to interact with medical schools and have productive discussions.
- WIU-Quad Cities will be having activities this week in honor of Engineering Week.
- The College of Arts and Sciences student speaker series will be held at 7:00 p.m. Thursday, February 22 in Currens Hall.

C. Student Government Association Report

(Madison Lynn, SGA representative to Faculty Senate)

- Ms. Lynn reported that last week she and SGA President Grant Reed submitted to SGA a bill of resolution on the funding of higher education, upon the request of Chairperson Rock. She told senators the bill was modeled after and used language from the resolution approved by Faculty Senate. A friendly amendment to list all SGA Cabinet members as sponsors and all SGA Senators as authors in a show of solidarity was approved. The bill

passed unanimously, and Mr. Reed and Ms. Lynn are in the process of distributing it to legislators.

- Ms. Lynn reported that students may be asking permission of faculty to pass petitions around in the first few minutes before their classes as they prepare for upcoming SGA elections.

D. Other Announcements

1. Ballots were mailed to eligible faculty on Monday, February 19 to vote for one Senator At-Large to serve a one-year term on Faculty Senate beginning Fall 2018.
2. Admissions has invited faculty to participate in calls to prospective students on March 6 and 7 from 5:15-7:00 p.m. in the Admissions Office. Chairperson Rock pointed out that everyone has a stake in increasing enrollment and encouraged senators if they can fit it into their schedules to participate in the phonathon.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

A. Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction (CCPI)

(Anita Hardeman, Chair)

1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Theatre and Dance

a. Request for Change in Minor

i. Theatre

CHANGE IN MINOR APPROVED

2. Curricular Requests from the School of Music

a. Request for Change in Option

i. Music Therapy

CHANGE IN OPTION APPROVED

B. Council for Instructional Technology (CIT)

(Justin Ehrlich, Chair)

1. Scantron Usage Recommendation

Dr. Ehrlich reported that Interim Provost Neumann asked the Executive Committee to take a look at alternatives to Scantrons, and the Executive Committee charged CIT with that responsibility. He added that the University's Scantron machine is dying, so an alternative must be determined to replace it. CIT conducted a survey of full-time faculty, saw demos, and considered various alternatives. They recommend the University adopt Remark's Optical Mark Recognition (OMR) system. Dr. Ehrlich stated that, while this system does not have to be much different than Scantron, it offers the ability for faculty to create their own bubble sheets so that, for example, if they want the bubbles to be directly underneath the question to avoid errors, that can be accommodated.

Andy Woerly, Consultant for University Technology User Support Services, introduced Jenna Wilkerson from The Business Centre of Quincy, with whom WIU has its Ricoh contract. Ms. Wilkerson, who is a dealer for Ricoh, told senators Ricoh partners with 60 to 70 different software companies to help with teaching and organizational flow. Remark

OMR is part of Ricoh's partnership with Gravic. She stated that besides faculty being able to change their answer sheets, Remark OMR will allow faculty to drill down into the data and has different options for presenting student results.

Steve Joslin from Gravic joined the meeting remotely to provide senators with a demo overview of the Remark OMR system. The system will allow faculty to make surveys, evaluations, or any type of form, including those created personally by the faculty member. The system uses Microsoft Word and, if desired, the answer bubble sheet can look almost exactly like that provided by Scantron. Ricoh multi-function printers (MFP) and software are used to read image files that can then be processed to determine test results. Software can be downloaded from the website. Mr. Joslin stated that bubble test sheets would be printed on regular paper rather than Scantron sheets, eliminating form costs and simplifying printing needs. If faculty create their own forms, they can make a template using the software; there are also some pre-devised higher education forms, such as 100- or 200-question test forms.

Faculty scan in a copy of the answer key, and the software can also support multiple test versions if faculty have large classes or more than one section and want to distribute different versions of the same test. Mr. Joslin showed senators how the system flags double answers, skipped questions, and answers that are unclear, such as crossed-out bubbles. Faculty can report the test results using the default report, or there are a number of test grading reports built into the software that can be chosen. Faculty can specify their own benchmarks or use ones that are automatically set up in the system; faculty can also drill down into the results to see if students need help with specific items. Reports can be sorted in terms of statistics and show personalized headers and footers. Files can be exported to a variety of gradebooks and other systems.

Some of the reports that were featured during the demonstration included:

- test analysis reports, which can show the hardest and easiest questions, students with similar answers, and class frequently distribution;
- student response reports, which shows all students with all of their correct and incorrect answers and the answers they left blank;
- student grade reports, which can be printed and handed out to students to show their responses and what they missed;
- item analysis reports, which show a question-by-question breakdown; and
- learning objectives reports, which allow faculty to group questions together..

Mr. Joslin told senators that more advanced grading options allow faculty to weight questions or make some questions extra credit. Once faculty set up an advanced answer key, they can reload it anytime.

Ms. Wilkerson asked if Remark OMC is able to connect with Desire2Learn. Mr. Joslin does not think the Remark system can directly "talk" to Desire2Learn, but Gravic does have customers that use Desire2Learn, and customers can set up a .csv file for importing. He added that most formats use student ID and total score or grade per item when importing. Rebecca Slater, Director of University Technology User Support Services, related that when the demo was run for Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (CITR) Director Roger Runquist, he was not comfortable that it would import into Desire2Learn due to other instances where he has tried to import .csv files.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked how sensitive the scanner is to black ink versus pencil responses. Ms. Wilkerson replied that this would be work similar to scanning any other document. She added that if students use pencil, the system may flag those answers if they are light, and the professor can then check them individually.

Senator Franken asked if some questions can be worth two points and other questions worth four points. Mr. Joslin replied that this is possible; professors can set whatever point value they wish for individual questions during the template process or in the advanced answer key window. Ms. Wilkerson added that professors can set up questions where students must write a short sentence for the answer or draw a graph, which would be something that professors would manually grade and assign a point value to the response. The Remark OMR system would save the image of the written response or graph.

Parliamentarian Kaul asked where the data resides – whether it resides only on the server or on the individual machines – and who owns the data. Ms. Wilkerson responded that this depends on what version the customer purchases; the cloud version stores data in the cloud, but if software licenses are purchased the data would reside on the individual PCs. Mr. Joslin added that the demo he showed senators is desktop-based, and data would be stored locally.

Senator Perabo asked if the Scantron sheets can be printed on any machine using the Remark OMR system. Ms. Slater responded that the sheets can be printed on any machine, but scanning must be done on Ricoh multi-function printers, and WIU is not fully Ricoh. She pointed out that cost will have to be part of this conversation; the cloud version would be twice what WIU currently spends on Scantron forms and maintenance on the machine. She thinks what makes more sense for WIU is to have the systems set up in a few selected locations, such as deans' offices or other central locations. Senator Perabo asked if the intention is to have a long-term contract with Ricoh, but Ms. Slater responded that if the University decided to replace Ricoh copier with Canon, the Remark OMR system would work on those as well or any other multi-function copier. She told senators that the University spends about \$10,000 per year on Scantron forms; not having to purchase these forms would offset the cost of placing the Remark OMR system on a selected few desktops, taking into account that this would also have to take into account the cost of printing. University Technology has worked with Dr. Runquist to duplicate the current Scantron forms so that faculty can keep using that format with the Remark OMR system if they choose.

Senator Allison remarked that the Department of English uses Scantrons infrequently. She asked who currently pays for the Scantron sheets. She wonders if the change will just mean shifting the cost of printing to the departments. Ms. Slater responded that this is currently paid by University Technology, and she does not anticipate that will change, but departments would be printing more paper so there would likely be some cost differential to be shifted. Senator Allison remarked that her department limits how much individual faculty members can print. Ms. Slater offered to provide information regarding how many Scantron sheets are scanned by departments across the University and a cost per page, although she admitted that toner and paper costs might increase for departments in future. She added that University Technology would still print out the evaluation piece for faculty, and that is the majority of the Scantron usage. Senator Allison asked if the Scantron evaluations would continue after the new system is adopted; Ms. Slater replied that the idea at this time is that they would continue to be printed in uTech, who would also scan them if desired by faculty.

Senator Allison asked if she would be expected to walk to the dean's office to do the scanning because for English faculty in Simpkins Hall that is a trip to the other end of campus. Ms. Slater replied that a machine would probably also be set up in Stipes Hall 126, where the current Scantron machine is located, but it was thought that other locations could be available around the campus so that faculty do not have to go to Stipes.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if it is fair to assume that the cost to faculty would be that of adding one extra page – the score sheet – to each test. Ms. Slater explained that the difference in cost is because the University pays a significant amount yearly for Scantrons

sheets, and with the Remark OMR the printing would occur in designated testing areas whereas now the forms are obtained from uTech. She added that faculty would be printing one scoring or bubble sheet for each student, not a single score sheet for the test.

Senator Boynton stated that she does not use Scantrons. She asked if the option to replace the current failing Scantron machines was considered. Ms. Slater replied that the current Scantron machine is very aged and dated, but the University could buy a new one. She warned, however, that if the machine were to break tomorrow, there would be nothing right now to replace it with, and if it were to occur during finals week it would be a big issue, although there may be an eBay solution if that were to occur. Ms. Slater explained that what is being considered is shifting numbers around, changing from a physical machine designated for Scantrons to a multi-function printer that does not have a dedicated purpose and is available across the campus, but the costs overall would be equal. She stated that if the University were to select locations for the desktop model, the change can be done for about the same price; although the cost for paper would be shifted to the various areas, the University as a whole and University Technology would not be paying any more than currently. Ms. Slater related that the Scantron machine was down for a full day during finals one time, and that is occurring more and more. University Technology keeps maintaining the old machine, but it costs \$2,500 to \$3,000 per year for maintenance.

Senator Boynton related she was one of the 95 faculty on the survey who said Scantrons were not important. She asked how many faculty were surveyed because if it went out to all full-time faculty then two-fifths of them answered it and three-fifths did not use Scantrons. She asked how many faculty actually use Scantrons. Ms. Slater responded that the machine is heavily used.

Mr. Woerly stated that University Technology has looked at the machine's history; when he came to WIU 18 years ago, there would be people lined up down the hall in Stipes to use the machine. He would like to see WIU transition to the Remark OMR system because it would expand what can be done going forward. Mr. Woerly pointed out that if at least two multi-function copiers were set up with the new system, if one of them was out of service there would still be another one to use, which is a step up from what the University has currently. He told senators that some institutions have faculty purchase their own Scantron sheets, which are sold in their bookstores, but he does not think that's a good solution. He does not think, however, that Scantron sheets are always being used efficiently at WIU; he sees stacks of them sometimes in rooms being used as scrap paper. Mr. Woerly said that although Scantrons have a lot of function for WIU, he thinks it is time for the University to explore moving forward with another alternative.

Senator Roberts asked if there are particular departments on campus that use Scantrons heavily and generate most of the results. Dr. Ehrlich replied that the Department of Management and Marketing was one of the heaviest users. He added that the more departments used Scantrons, the more they tended to report. Ms. Slater added that the data is available by percentage of usage and can be provided to senators if desired. Senator Roberts stated that if there is a particular vested interest in some departments, it would be useful to have their insights or concerns about what technology to adopt. He asked what conclusions the Council for Instructional Technology reached from the survey results. Dr. Ehrlich responded that half of the respondents said Scantrons are heavily used and 25 percent responded they are extensively used, so they are an important technology for the classroom; 25 percent said they could not replace Scantrons with WesternOnline, and 40 percent did not think they could be replaced with another technology. Dr. Ehrlich told senators that CIT looked at a lot of solutions and thought that Remark was the best approach to solve the problem.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt thanked the presenters. He observed that one of the potential avenues for the Remark system is that every department could conceivably use it for

things like designing quick, simple surveys to send to alumni or investors, for example. He thinks this could have a lot of benefits in terms of maintaining contacts with alumni.

Interim Provost Neumann stressed that Scantrons are the only acceptable method for course evaluations, and that is an important point. Senator Allison asked if the Remark system is chosen if the switch would be only for exams and not for student evaluations. Ms. Slater responded that the change would apply to both. She noted that the change would not require a heavy upfront investment, unlike most other technology, and can be switched over for the cost that is currently being paid on equipment the University already owns. She added that if WIU decided three years from now to pursue a completely electronic system and do away with Scantrons, faculty could just stop using them, and University Technology would not have invested in any infrastructure.

Parliamentarian Kaul asked what the final recommendation is from CIT. Dr. Ehrlich responded that CIT's final recommendation is to choose the Remark OMR system because it provides the same capabilities as Scantron but also has additional capabilities. He stated that it can be distributed across the campus so that it is more accessible to faculty members, and CIT thinks it provides a really good approach to test scoring.

College of Arts and Sciences Dean Sue Martinelli-Fernandez stated that if the Dean's office is a possible central location for entering data from faculty evaluations, it should be pointed out that the Dean is a level of evaluation, so she would think that there would have to be some keying in by a neutral person. Interim Provost Neumann responded that the University Technology location in Stipes 126 would continue for faculty evaluations. Ms. Slater agreed that faculty evaluations must be objective, and University Technology has and will continue to fill that role. The Dean's office would only be used for faculty exams. Parliamentarian Kaul stated this was also the reason he asked where the data would reside; there may be contractual considerations, so it is important that the data be maintained in a safe place with control over who has access because maintaining some kind of secrecy about this type of data is important. Senator Franken pointed out that currently the information gets emailed to faculty, but Parliamentarian Kaul stated that presumably the information stays internal, and when an external entity is brought in these types of questions need to be asked, and individuals need to be satisfied that there is some expectation of privacy. Ms. Slater responded that with the desktop model, the data would be saved internally within the University's infrastructure and protected in the same way it is currently.

Senator Bellott asked if there is a yearly usage fee. Ms. Slater responded that the University currently spends \$10,000 per year for Scantron sheets. Senator Bellott asked how much Scantron costs have increased over the past ten years; Ms. Slater responded that they have not increased very much at all. Senator Bellott asked if the cost of the Remark software has gone up. Ms. Wilkerson replied she has not seen the cost go up at all over the past three or four years. Senator Bellott observed that if the cost of the Remark system goes up yearly, Scantrons may be the less expensive model. Ms. Slater stated that the model being recommended is locally installed rather than cloud based, which is much more costly. Senator Tarrant asked how long the University has used Scantrons; Ms. Slater responded that the current machine is about ten years old. Senator Tarrant asked if that is the typical lifetime for a Scantron machine. Ms. Slater responded that the machine is well beyond the time period when it is recommended that a new machine be purchased, and it is out of warranty, which is why University Technology purchases annual maintenance contracts. She added that if the machine breaks, technicians are supposed to fix it within one day, but the older the machine gets, the harder it becomes to find component parts. Senator Tarrant asked how long the machine will be able to continue to be maintained; Ms. Slater replied this depends on how long the vendor will continue to support the model, but University Technology has not received any indication that the vendor will not support after-market maintenance for the foreseeable future. She stated

that the “do nothing” approach (waiting until the machine breaks for good) is one potential model that can be considered if the University is willing to take on that potential risk, but the machine could break during finals and not be able to be fixed for some period of time. She stated University Technology wanted to bring the potential risk before Faculty Senate now while something can still be done to mitigate it.

Senator Tarrant asked if there is a side-by-side comparison of the Remark system with the current Scantron machine. Ms. Slater responded the annual costs are the same, there is no initial outlay, and the licenses are equal to the amount spent yearly on Scantron sheets and annual maintenance of the current machine. She added that there is no initial cost because the Remark system will work on any printer or computer at the University; there is a software license cost that would be offset by no longer having to purchase the Scantron sheets and annual maintenance agreement. She added there is always the potential risk that Remark will increase its costs in future, but that cannot be predetermined.

Senator Boynton asked what the Senate’s role is in the decision making process. Dr. Ehrlich responded that the recommendation would go to the Interim Provost and to IT Governance. Senator Tasdan asked if different companies were considered. Ms. Slater responded that different companies were considered, but Remark has by far the best overall approach. She added that University Technology looked into mobile devices that can be downloaded on faculty phones, but those come with FERPA issues and did not have the functionality that Remark offered. She said that other models were more expensive, and the Remark model offered the ability to maintain the status quo for usability at the same cost. Senator Franken asked what the cost of a new Scantron machine would be; Ms. Slater replied that it would cost \$3,000 to \$4,000. Senator Franken asked how long a new Scantron machine would last; Ms. Slater responded that it would likely last five to seven years and would include \$12,000 to \$13,000 in annual fees.

Senator Bellott asked if other companies use less expensive Scantron sheets. Ms. Slater responded that CITR has successfully replicated the existing Scantron sheet, and University Technology today successfully attempted to scan them onto the existing Scantron machine, so that could be used immediately. She warned, however, that the existing maintenance contract is no longer valid if non-approved forms are used, so it would be immediately voided. She added that part of the reason the Scantron sheets are expensive is that they are customized with the WIU logo, so the University could purchase those sheets less expensively.

Senator Bellott asked if the additional workload for personnel in the Dean’s office has been considered if the scanning is moved to these offices. Ms. Slater pointed out that the decision could be made to only have one machine in the University Technology office, as is done currently, which would be far less expensive for the University and would more than offset the cost of the new system. She suggested deans’ offices as possible locations because she thought it would be more convenient, would still stay within the cost constraints, and would provide more flexibility for faculty. Senator Bellott suggested that University Technology talk to the deans about this suggestion before a decision is made.

Chairperson Rock pointed out that the recommendation from CIT is to phase out Scantrons and replace them with the Remark OMR software. Senator Rahman stated she is convinced by the people who use Scantrons and find added value in the new system, as well as by the arguments presented, and thinks the University should phase out Scantrons. Parliamentarian Kaul stated that if there are no objections to the report, it can be forwarded on with the Senate’s recommendation, but if there are objections it can be returned to the table for further consideration. Senator Allison stated she does not know enough about Scantrons to support a recommendation and would abstain from voting.

SENATOR ALLISON OBJECTED TO THE REPORT

Motion: To return the report to the agenda (Hironimus-Wendt/Franken)

**MOTION TO RESTORE THE REPORT TO THE AGENDA APPROVED 19 YES
– 0 NO – 2 ABSTENTIONS**

Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that he assumes that WIU owns the Scantron machine currently being used, but he wonders if the University would lose the ability to use it if the switch is made to the Remark system. Ms. Slater responded that the University could continue to use it, but she would recommend dropping the maintenance and not purchasing additional Scantron forms to offset the costs of the new system. She added that if the maintenance agreement is dropped, the University could use its own bubble sheet forms.

Senator Macchi asked how much time there would be between WIU dropping the maintenance contract and implementation of the new system, if it is approved. She wonders how long the decision making process will take, installation across campus, and training for users. Ms. Slater estimates this could all be completed by the end of this calendar year, but she would want to take a very thoughtful approach to the process. She explained the first step, if approved by Faculty Senate, would be taking the recommendation to IT Governance; if approved by IT Governance, the next step would be the implementation phase. She said other decisions would include determining who would do the training and establishing a partnership with CITR. She added that she would not want to make the change right before finals but would anticipate that the transition could happen quickly, perhaps next summer. Senator Macchi asked if the maintenance fee is paid by calendar year or fiscal year; Ms. Slater replied that it is paid by the fiscal year. Senator Macchi asked if that means there might be a six-month to year risk; Ms. Slater confirmed that is correct.

Motion: To accept the report (Rahman/Hironimus-Wendt)

Senator Tarrant asked what the back-up plan is if the Scantron machine no longer works within the six months to a year timeframe. Ms. Slater responded that she is risk adverse, so she would not allow the University to not have maintenance on the Scantron machine without having a solution in place. She stated that if the Remark system was implemented in February 2019, she would rather pay for maintenance than run without support for nine months. She added that she will have a better idea of what would be involved once the proposal gets IT Governance approval because there is a big difference between rolling the system out to Stipes Hall alone and rolling it out to every dean's office.

MOTION APPROVED 9 YES – 1 NO – 11 ABSTENTIONS

Chairperson Rock observed that the motion passes but not with overwhelming support. Senator Bellot asked if the vote is supposed to pass with a majority of the quorum. Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that his understanding is that a majority of "yes" votes are needed, and since there were not a majority of "yes" votes the vote is "no." Chairperson Rock stated that this would not preclude the higher levels of administration from going forward with the proposal, but Faculty Senate was unable to provide a strong positive recommendation.

Ms. Slater observed that some of the abstention votes may have been because senators did not feel they have enough information to move the proposal forward. She asked if there is any way that senators could email her a list of their concerns and University Technology representatives come back to Faculty Senate in the future to present again. Senator Tarrant stated that instead of presenting to Faculty Senate again, he thinks it would be helpful if senators could play with the system hands-on in some sort of sandbox. Senator Tarrant

said he abstained because he does not know if he would be comfortable using the system. Ms. Slater will work to get the Remark OMR system set up on a PC in Stipes 126 so that faculty can try it out.

IV. Old Business

A. Size of the Senate

Chairperson Rock related that the fall reapportionment will result in the size of the Senate being reduced from 23 senators to 20. The Executive Committee has proposed an alternative model which would freeze the number of senators at 23; reduce the number of at-large senators from six Macomb and one Quad Cities to four Macomb and one Quad Cities; and divide the remaining 18 senators between the four academic colleges based on their proportion of total full-time faculty. Chairperson Rock stated that research has shown that the at-large faculty members were originally set at six because there were six academic colleges at the time; the Quad Cities senator was added later. With the model proposed by the Executive Committee, based on 512 faculty (the official faculty count during Fall 2018 reapportionment), there would be seven Arts and Sciences senators, four Business and Technology and Education and Human Services senators each, and three senators for Fine Arts and Communication. Chairperson Rock told senators this is not the only model that Faculty Senate could consider, but the math works out. He told them they could also decide to continue with the current model, which is to assign one senator for every 40 full-time faculty members in each college.

Senator Boynton thanked Chairperson Rock for his work on the proposed model. She observed that the Faculty Senate Reapportionment History document shows that for a long time there were 21 senators, then 22, then 23, before dropping to 20 last fall. She asked if the proposal would require the Senate to be locked in at a certain number, and why the number chosen was 23 rather than 21 or 25, other than because that is the number of senators currently. Chairperson Rock responded there was no reason for choosing 23 as the number of senators other than that during the previous discussion at Senate it was suggested that maybe the size should be frozen at where it is currently.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt likes the proposal, particularly choosing a fixed number and then divvying up the number of senators rather than changing the total number every two years. Chairperson Rock stated that if the proposal is approved, it would have to go out to all full-time faculty for a vote. He does not think it would be feasible to implement the change the next academic year (2018-19) but would recommend that it be implemented the following one (2019-20). Senator Bellott asked if there is official wording; Chairperson Rock responded that language would need to be drafted up if the proposal is approved. Senator Bellot asked how the change would be implemented; the chart shows 3.05 senators for Fine Arts and Communication, but he is unsure what the difference is between three senators and 3.05. Chairperson Rock responded that the numbers on the chart would be rounded up if the difference is .5 points or higher. He noted all colleges would gain seats from where they would be following the Fall 2017 reapportionment results, but the at-large senators would be reduced by two. Two at-large senators will go off of the Senate in Fall 2019, and they could simply not be replaced. Chairperson Rock added that he does not have any strong opinions about the proposal.

Senator Rahman likes the proposal because it is good to have an odd number of senators and she likes the idea of more senators rather than less. Chairperson Rock stated that one thing to keep in mind is that some colleges do sometimes have difficulty finding people to run for seats, particularly the Colleges of Business and Technology and Fine Arts and Communication, so there may be some practical limit as to how large the Senate should go. Senator Roberts supports the larger number of senators compared to how many eligible faculty there are because it invites more participation, and hopefully there will be enthusiasm to be elected. He likes the idea of a larger representation of senators for a diminishing number of faculty, so he supports this model. Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if this proposal will come back to Faculty Senate, at which point the

details will be hammered out. Chairperson Rock responded that the Executive Committee will draft language that would come back for a vote and would include input from this model.

Motion: To accept the Executive Committee proposal (Allison/Roberts)

School of Computer Sciences Director Dennis DeVolder asked if the Executive Committee has played with the numbers to see if there are any situations where a college might be entitled to 2.95 senators but, because the membership has been locked at a specific number, that 2.95 becomes two rather than three. Chairperson Rock stated that with this configuration, the numbers work out, but he tried another model keeping the total number at 23 with six at-large senators from Macomb and one from the Quad Cities, and the math did not work for dropping the number of college senators to 16. He added that if there are substantial changes in the numbers of faculty, it could change the percentages for each college, which could potentially, for example, make 7.31 (the number of Arts and Sciences senators under this model) grow to 7.5, which would affect the other colleges, or Business and Technology could drop to three senators rather than four if their percentage falls below 3.5 (it is currently 3.66). Senator Boynton pointed out that in the past the numbers have stayed very stable. Chairperson Rock pointed out that another option would be to freeze the number of college senators.

Senator Macchi noted that over the last three years faculty numbers have dropped from 613 to 512. She asked if the model would be reevaluated in a certain number of years to make sure that the proportions remain accurate. Chairperson Rock responded that Faculty Senate can reevaluate the Constitution whenever it wants. Senator Roberts asked if there is a way to oblige future senators to reevaluate the size of the Senate every five to ten years. Chairperson Rock responded that Faculty Senate is obliged to do reapportionment every two years. He suggested that language could be added to make the Senate reevaluate the model to see if it is still accurate at the same time as biennial reapportionment is done.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if Dr. DeVolder can think of any ways that the proposal to set the total number at 23 with 18 of those distributed among the colleges based on relative proportion might become problematic in future. Dr. DeVolder responded that he has only heard of this proposal just now but wonders what would happen if the college proportions worked out to numbers of .5 or above for each. Senator Boynton pointed out that one possibility is to continue to allow the total number for the Senate to float but change the at-large to four Macomb senators and one from the Quad Cities, which would separate the two issues. Chairperson Rock pointed out that, alternatively, the Constitution currently specifies one college rep for every 40 faculty, but that could be changed to one for every 35 or another number; there are many models.

Senator Bellot likes the proposed model. He asked if the proposal could include language stating that if a situation such as Dr. DeVolder proposes were to occur, the college with the most senators would lose one, which would go to the college with the least. He pointed out that this would retain the number that represents the faculty but basically fixes the lower and higher numbers. He added that the Faculty Senate Reapportionment History shows 25 years of data, which is about as consistent as anyone could want. Chairperson Rock pointed out that in most of the earlier years, the total number of faculty was in the 600- rather than the 500-range. Parliamentarian Kaul pointed out that in 1993-2009 there were a fixed number of 21 senators and the total faculty size was a little over 600; Chairperson Rock pointed out that the size of the Senate was not fixed but based on the formula of one college senator for every 40 faculty members. Parliamentarian Kaul asked, with declining faculty, how the Senate reached the number 23; Chairperson Rock pointed out that the Quad Cities senator was added in 2013. Parliamentarian Kaul asked what will happen with rounding issues that cannot be resolved if the size is fixed at 23. Senator Hironimus-Wendt recommends that the Executive Committee take this question under advisement as it prepares a proposed amendment.

MOTION APPROVED 19 YES – 0 NO – 1 ABSTENTION

B. Committee on Provost and Presidential Performance

Chairperson Rock asked to add a piece of Old Business; there were no objections. He told senators that the results of the survey of the President and Provost have been completed. Senator Hironimus-Wendt, who was chairing the Committee on Provost and Presidential Performance, has stepped down, and one member of that committee would like for an additional senator to be elected in order to better distribute the amount of work. Senator Boynton volunteered to serve. There were no further nominations, and Senator Boynton was declared elected.

V. New Business

A. Budget Transparency Committee Membership

Chairperson Rock stated that Faculty Senate needs to constitute the membership of the newly created Budget Transparency Committee. He told senators that three members of the ad hoc Budget Transparency Committee – Senators Czechowski, Macchi, and Perabo – are willing to serve on the permanent committee. Volunteers are needed to represent the Colleges of Business and Technology and Education and Human Services. No senators from those colleges volunteered, so this item will return to Faculty Senate on March 6 under Old Business.

B. Ad Hoc FYE Program Review Committee Charge

The charge proposed for the ad hoc committee by the Executive Committee is:

- To review the operation and effectiveness of the academic component of FYE
- To detail the strengths and weakness of the current program
- To determine the effectiveness of FYE on retention
- To look at the original and revised objectives and goals of FYE and determine if it is meeting them
- To include information and results from student evaluation and surveys
- To look at what other institutions are doing and investigate alternative models
- To recommend changes to the program if warranted
- Other considerations as determined by the Committee

The ad hoc committee is asked to submit a status report by the end of spring semester 2018 and a final report at the end of fall semester 2018. The Executive Committee recommends that there be five members from any college and that Associate Provost Parsons serve as an ex-officio member.

Chairperson Rock stated that, on the basis of their expertise and comments in the past regarding FYE, he hopes Senators Macchi and Roberts will volunteer to serve on the ad hoc committee; both agreed to serve. Chairperson Rock would like to see others volunteer who are interested or have a stake in FYE. Senators McIlvaine-Newsad and Sajewski volunteered to serve. There were no further volunteers. This item will return to the March 6 agenda under Old Business in order to find one more member.

Chairperson Rock told senators that the Executive Committee created the charge based on discussions that took place at Faculty Senate. Senator Macchi asked if the charge “To look at the original and revised objectives and goals of FYE and determine if it is meeting them” is intended to mean that the ad hoc committee would look at the original 2005-2012 First-Year Experience Program, which has already gone through an entire University review and was voted on by Faculty Senate, or the current iteration of FYE since 2013 because the old program is very different than the current one. Senator Allison thinks the question raised at the previous Faculty Senate meeting was if the program is doing what it was meant to do, which refers to its original intent rather than its original program. Parliamentarian Kaul agreed the discussion was regarding the original intent as opposed to original actions of the program, adding that many are unaware how FYE originally

started and how it was revised. Senators suggested that this bullet point state “To look at the original **intent** and revised objectives and goals of FYE and determine if it is meeting them.”

Motion: To accept the charge (Rahman/Allison)

MOTION APPROVED 19 YES – 0 NO – 1 ABSTENTION

Motion: To adjourn (Roberts)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Susan Czechowski, Faculty Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary