

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Regular Meeting, 20 February 2024, 4:00 p.m.

Via Zoom and in Union Capitol Rooms

ACTION MINUTES

SENATORS PRESENT IN PERSON: J. Albarracin, D. Atherton, B. Bellott, G. Cabedo-Timmons, L. Ebert Wallace, D. Gravitt, D. Hunter, S. Ko, K. Perone, B. Petracovici, Y. Tang, S. Turkelli, L. Wipperling

SENATORS PRESENT VIA ZOOM: S. Bailey, D. Brown, E. Hamner, J. Land, J. Sarra, M. Shamsuddoha, K. Wiseley

EX-OFFICIO: Jeremy Robinett, Parliamentarian; Interim Provost Mark Mossman

SENATORS ABSENT: D. Barr, C. Chadwell, H. Elbe A. Lewis

GUESTS: Tom Blackford, Amy Burke, Craig Conrad, Sean Cordes, Rich Filipink, Jeffrey Keith, Samantha Klingler, Sarah Lawson, Hector Maymi-Sugranes, Lorette Oden, Jackie Price, Linda Prosis, Rashmi Sharma, Eric Sheffield, Cassandra Standberry

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. January 23, 2024

APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED

II. Announcements

A. Approvals from the Provost

1. Requests for Changes of Majors

- i. Broadcasting and Journalism
- ii. Construction and Facilities Management

B. Provost's Report

Interim Provost Mossman reported the Provost's office is now fully staffed with Kishor Kapale, Coordinator of Graduate Studies; Renee Polubinsky, Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies; and now Holly Nikels, Budget and Contracts Administrator, as well as Andrea Alveshere, Director of Assessment, Accreditation, and Strategic Planning. He said the Provost's office is in the process of reviewing all of the department criteria and departmental workload equivalent (DWE) documents.

Interim Provost Mossman observed that several events are being held in honors of Black History Month. There are also sporting events being held this weekend, and he encourages everyone to get out on campus.

B. Student Government Association (SGA) Report (Jeffrey Keith, SGA Director of Academic Affairs)

- SGA is planning a trip for their cabinet to visit WIU's Quad Cities campus.
- SGA's attorney general is no longer at the university.
- SGA has filled several miscellaneous positions recently.

- SGA has recently been informed that WIU's book award is being abolished.
- SGA has learned that the Board of Trustees plans to discuss sustainability in regard to the fee structure.

C. Other Announcements - None

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

A. Council on Admissions, Graduation, and Academic Standards (CAGAS)
(Rich Filipink, Chair)

1. Student Bereavement Policy

Dr. Filipink told senators the proposed policy is identical to WIU's existing bereavement policy for non-negotiated employees. He explained the intent is for students to report deaths in their families to the Student Development and Success Center (SDSC) who will notify faculty members of the possible utilization of three days of traveling for funerals or bereavement.

NO OBJECTIONS

B. Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction (CCPI)
(Amy Burke, Chair)

1. Curricular Requests from University Libraries

a. Request for New Course

i. LIB 101, Introduction to Library and Information Use, 1 s.h.

Senator Hunter noted that LIB 101 is not open to students who have taken LIB 201. He asked if students could take LIB 201 after taking this course. Library professor Sean Cordes explained that this statement was added to the catalog description at the request of CCPI. It is his understanding that LIB 201 will be placed in deep freeze. He explained that LIB 201 was a 3 s.h. course, and some things were taken from it to be included in LIB 101, which will feature applications of modern technology that will be used in a more practical manner. He added there would be no reason for students to take both courses.

Senator Hamner said he is very enthusiastic about the concept for the course and recognizes the need for better library orientation opportunities, an improved ability to detect truth from lies, and the opportunity for faculty to do epistemology actively among their students. He think, however, that this course seems to be attempting to do much more than a 1 s.h. course would normally and asked if University Libraries had considered making it 3 s.h. or what their motivation was in setting it as 1 s.h. Dr. Cordes replied the 1 s.h. course is intended to allow students to access and get credit to the material without impacting their other course load. He added that 3 s.h., with the amount of time required for programs, seems to be an impediment to students taking the course. University Libraries thought more students would be able to obtain the benefit from taking it if it was a 1 s.h. entry level. Senator Hamner encouraged University Libraries to consider removing some of the things LIB 101 is trying to do.

Senator Hamner related he taught a somewhat parallel course, LAS 195, which also tried to bring students into the door and orient them to understand the beginnings of what research looks like. He observed that, being familiar with ENG 180 and 280, he can see quite a few areas of overlap with LIB 101 and thinks there could be real value to cooperating and collaborating with others across campus. Several English faculty members expressed to Senator Hamner that LIB 101 seems to overlap with ENG 280, which also explicitly involves learning library research skills and evaluating the credibility of information. Dr. Cordes replied that part of the impetus for LIB 101 is the lessons University Libraries faculty teach that coincide with ENG 180 and 280. He said English faculty commonly bring their students to Malpass Library for the library research part of their courses, and University Libraries has been finding that there are a substantial number of students who either need to have the information earlier in their college careers or for whom their English classes are not fulfilling the purpose.

Senator Hamner asked if there might be a way to tighten up LIB 101 so that more of the overlap with ENG 280 could be avoided while also taking some of the burden off ENG 280 in terms of its library research expectations. He agrees there is much more to be learned than can easily fit in a 1, 2, or 3 s.h. course and wonders if this could be considered before Faculty Senate makes LIB 101 a formal part of the curriculum. University Libraries Dean Hector Maymi-Sugranes responded he has no problem with collaborating; he thinks the sooner students confront these issues, the more it will help with their studies. He said University Libraries plans to collaborate with not only English but with other departments to do library research and other things.

Chair Albarracin asked what is special about library research that would cause overlap because every course at the university includes a research component, so this is not owned by the Department of English or by University Libraries. She asked what ENG 280 teaches about library research. Senator Hamner pointed out phrases in the proposed new course request that cover topics that are also central to the expectations for ENG 280, such as teaching APA and MLA style and “learning to synthesize and integrate information from multiple sources to support arguments.” He wonders if the experience for students could be strengthened if some of these duties are divvied up more strategically and if there is an agreement with the Writing Director to remove some duties from ENG 280. He noted, though, that what might stand in the way is the ENG 280 is absolutely required for all students. Senator Hamner stated that it may not be necessary to do any of this, but he wanted to make senators aware of the concerns from English faculty that LIB 101 overlaps quite extensively and to see if a solution can be determined. He does not know if there is time to come to a solution, but he hopes there is.

Interim Provost Mossman pointed out that the learning objectives and guidelines for all the composition courses and many other courses are provided by the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI), so if there is overlap that could be a real problem. He does not think parts of ENG 280 can be separated out because ENG 100, 180, and 280 are very clearly designed by the state in what they need to do for transfer articulation.

Senator Tang remarked that the rationale for LIB 101 was very well written. He noted that using Google and Wikipedia to perform research is listed as a course objective for LIB 101, and artificial intelligence is included in the catalog description, but he could not find it in the course objectives.

He asked to what extent artificial intelligence will be taught. Dr. Cordes responded that AI will be taught in an appropriate manner for the research tools of the course. He said it is hard to be more specific right now because, for example, generative text is now being used in databases for the first time while three months ago it was not, so AI is a moving target. He pointed out that many of the course objectives for LIB 101, beyond focusing on advanced research techniques with web tools, were included and previously being taught in LIB 201; the requirements have either been reduced in format and made more practical or extended to include tools that were not being used five years ago. Dr. Cordes pointed out one example of this is Google Scholar, which was not recommended in the past; now University Libraries has a direct link to Google Scholar which ties directly into their databases and is a tool WIU students will be able to use. He said University Libraries is trying to integrate goals that are ancillary to main databases they use in order to tie into practicality. Dr. Cordes noted that another aspect that is not listed specifically on the form is modality; he met with a student today who had written a ten-page paper entirely on his phone. He said LIB 101 will not focus on but will discuss Google Drive and how to access those suites.

Dean Maymi-Sugranes thinks the university has a real opportunity with LIB 101. He observed that, after being a professor for 20 years, one of the first things students will do when given an assignment is to use Google, and this course will help with that and show them different routes to consider. He believes that LIB 101 will not compete with anyone but will be a good first step for students and noted that, in academia, redundancy is sometimes good because it provides reinforcement.

Senator Ebert Wallace remarked in response to Senator Tang's earlier question that AI is included under the sixth course objective as a refining tool. She asked if LIB 201 is 3 s.h. and if it is already in deep freeze because she could not find it in the undergraduate catalog. Dr. Cordes replied it is not frozen yet and is listed in the UNIV course section. Senator Ebert Wallace asked if LIB 101 is a smaller version of 201. Dr. Cordes confirmed that 101 is a smaller version that focuses on practicality. He explained that 201, for example, has a whole section on using the Library of Congress classification, but that should not require two weeks of class time nowadays; it might be valid to study this briefly for certain assignments but certainly not for more than one day. Dr. Cordes recalled that there was a time between 2005 and 2015 when things were still in flux, but now, for example, it is considered acceptable to do scholarly research by doing a .gov search on Google, which was not taught in the past. He said the course focuses on the things WIU students will need to complete the kinds of assignments the Library has seen come through in the past ten to 15 years.

Dr. Filipink observed that he found LIB 201 in the undergraduate catalog, but it is listed as a 1 s.h. course. Linda Prosis in the Provost's office confirmed that 201 went from 3 s.h. to 1 s.h. in 2016. Dr. Cordes observed that the content still remains dated, which is the big issue; the objectives for LIB 101 were taken directly from the LIB 201 syllabus but modified to remove the older material.

Senator Hamner asked whether there is sufficient time to improve on LIB 101 and tighten it up while still being able to offer it in the fall. Parliamentarian Robinett responded that, procedurally, if anyone objects to the course, it will be tabled, and require approval of two-thirds of the senators present to bring it back to the table for further discussion. He said at that point a senator could make a motion to send the request back to CCPI,

after which it would have the potential to come back to Faculty Senate. Senator Hamner said he does not have a sense of how much time these steps might take. He stated that because he thinks this course is valuable and needed, he wants it to be able to be offered, but he would like to see it streamlined more tightly. He is unsure, however, whether this is possible since it is already February 20 and it is desired for the course to be offered this fall.

Chair Albarracin reiterated that she does not think anyone at WIU can claim ownership on evaluating research and evidence because every department does that. Parliamentarian Robinett asked if Senator Hamner has formally objected to the CCPI report. Senator Hamner replied he has not; rather, he has only been asking questions. He expressed a desire to hear whether it is plausible to try to improve upon LIB 101 and still have time to offer it this fall. Parliamentarian Robinett reiterated that if the course is objected to and is then voted to come back to the table for further discussion tonight, a motion could be made to send it back to CCPI, at which point CCPI could moderate a discussion between representatives from English and University Libraries.

Senator Petracovici asked if it would not be easier to just tweak LIB 201 with new content than to create a new course because 201 is already on the books and just needs to be updated. Dr. Cordes responded that was considered by University Libraries' curriculum committee, but they thought too much of the content was no longer applicable to students. Senator Petracovici suggested that it is not too late to simply put the new content from LIB 101 back into 201, and it would not be necessary to go through all of these steps to create a new course.

Parliamentarian Robinett recalled that when this course was considered by CCPI it was mentioned that as a 1 s.h. introductory class it might be able to be offered in the summer bridge program at some point. He observed that this would allow summer bridge students to take a 2 s.h. Gen Ed and this 1 s.h. course in library science to better prepare them for when they come to WIU in the fall. He added that it was mentioned in CCPI that students are arriving without the library skills needed to be successful in their first semester.

Senator Atherton asked what the timeline is to be able to offer this course in the fall. CCPI Chair Amy Burke responded that as long as CCPI receives the course in time for it to come back to Faculty Senate for its last meeting in April, the course can get into the fall catalog.

Dean Maymi-Sugranes expressed his agreement with Parliamentarian Robinett that summer bridge students could be helped with this course, and he thinks it would help with retention. He thinks students need to be exposed to this kind of knowledge before the semester starts. Senator Hamner asked if University Libraries is trying to offer LIB 101 this summer rather than starting it in the fall. Interim Provost Mossman clarified that this course is not part of the bridge program for this summer, although it could potentially be included in future summers. Dr. Cordes added that University Libraries is also looking into offering this course in the Quad Cities as part of a dual enrollment program.

Senator Hamner observed it seems there is enough time for University Libraries to work with CCPI to streamline the course, which is his biggest concern. He still thinks the course needs to be tightened up to be doable for a 1 s.h. class because it looks to him, since he has taught this material in the past, like too much to cover in one hour. He believes that if partnerships can

be built to bring together faculty teaching this course with the faculty who oversee writing at WIU, it could have great benefit, particularly if students could be specifically sent to take this course.

Interim Provost Mossman observed that typically when there is a question of whether a course impinges on another area there is a letter of support from that area, and he thinks this would be a good idea to strengthen the request. Dr. Cordes responded the reason he did not include one is because LIB 201 was already on the books with similar content. Parliamentarian Robinett noted that CCPI is very thorough in looking for possible areas of overlap, but they did not think that LIB 101 presented an overlap situation.

Senator Ebert Wallace pointed out that students start registering for fall classes in the middle of March, so if University Libraries wants students to take this course in Fall 2024 they would want to have it ready soon for them to register. She thinks that if the desire is to have students take this in the fall, there really is not time to send it back to CCPI. Senator Wipperling asked if LIB 101 is a first-year experience course; Dr. Cordes responded it is not designated as a Y course. Senator Wipperling observed that first-year students register all summer, so if it is being presented as a first-year class there would be time to catch these students, but not second- or third-year students.

Senator Hamner remarked he is hearing on one hand that there is time and on the other that there is not, and he wonders if anyone else can speak to the timeline. He asked when CCPI next meets and if it would be possible to give them a tightened version of LIB 101 to consider at that meeting. He wants to determine if objecting to the course basically means that it would not be offered until Spring 2025. Ms. Burke responded that CCPI's next meeting is this Thursday, February 22. She said while she understands the concern with students enrolling in March, students can often be recommended to register for specific 1 s.h. courses that their advisors think they should take. Registrar Sarah Lawson confirmed that as long as the course is approved in April, it will get on the books and students will be allowed to register. She noted that although registration begins in March, open registration begins April 1, and new students register in June and July. Ms. Prorise added that as soon as she gets the paperwork from Ms. Hamm, she has the Provost sign it and immediately distributes it to the Registrar's office so that they can get the course loaded right away. Parliamentarian Robinett said he and Ms. Hamm think the earliest LIB 101 could be reconsidered by CCPI would be March 7; it would then come back to Faculty Senate on March 26, provided agreement is able to be reached.

SENATOR HAMNER OBJECTED TO THE CCPI REPORT

Senator Hamner stated that, given what he has heard about the timelines, he formally objects to the course because he thinks it will become a better course for all concerned, including those teaching it, if it can be tightened and more people can get on board with it. Parliamentarian Robinett explained that now that the report has been objected to, it would take a motion and two-thirds approval of the senators present to bring it back to the table for further discussion.

Motion: To bring the report back to the table (Hamner/Wipperling)

MOTION APPROVED 20 YES – 0 NO – 0 ABSTENTIONS

Motion: To review the curriculum process and seek to strengthen the course and narrow its focus so that it can be as strong as possible as a one credit hour option, and that it be given the chance to be heard by CCPI and come back to Faculty Senate, assuming their approval (Hamner)

Dean Maymi-Sugranes observed that CCPI already saw the course. He asked what the English Department is requesting specifically. He expressed a willingness to consult with English Department representatives but said he needs to understand where the overlap is, after which Dr. Cordes will work fast to revise the document. Chair Albarracin asked if Senator Hamner had discussions with the English Department formally or just with his colleagues in the department. Senator Hamner replied he spoke informally with colleagues. He believes there are multiple people in the English Department who are able to respond quickly to a request to help make this course better and to develop a stronger relationship between LIB 101 and the composition courses. Senator Hamner also thinks there is an opportunity to tighten what the course is trying to do so that it is more appropriate to a 1 s.h. course rather than a 3 s.h. course. Senator Wippering remarked it sounds like the Library representatives are asking for names of people to reach out to.

Dr. Cordes told Senator Hamner he also needs details about where the perceived overlap is. He explained that, for topics such as MLA and APA style, the Library does not teach how to do intense citations such as the English Department teaches; the Library teaches students various techniques they can use to gather information together from various sources and how to find things on Google Scholar by title. He is not sure if these differentiations are completely understood when considering the two courses. Dr. Cordes expressed a willingness to explore this but would like to have a direct liaison to reach out to and clarification about where LIB 101 and ENG 280 overlap so that he can modify LIB 101 to remove that concern. Dr. Cordes recalled the Library ran into an overlap situation when they created a research methods course, but it was not difficult to show how research in the various disciplines differentiated. He thinks that LIB 101 and ENG 280 may be so close that the differences are nuanced because ideally a student would take the Library course first so that they know how to do the research before taking 280.

Parliamentarian Robinett remarked that it sounds like there needs to be a conversation between English and the Library that would clarify any potential issues on the request form. He observed that Senator Hamner's motion does not yet have a second and suggested that one option would be to leave the CCPI report tabled, as it is currently. He explained that if English and the Library can work out their issues, the revised form could then come back to Faculty Senate rather than going through the CCPI process again. This would potentially let senators vote on the request at their next meeting on March 5. Senator Hamner replied this is an even better idea so long as it is allowable within Faculty Senate's structure. He is sure that English Chair Marjorie Allison will be happy to work with Library representatives, and there are others in the English Department who work with writing studies and can better address the specifics. Senator Hamner would like to see a focus on the library access and information assessment elements. He thinks Google, Wikipedia, and AI are all well worth thinking hard about and helping students learn to use more critically. He just thinks that LIB 101 is taking on so much that it will be difficult for it to achieve what everyone wants it to.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Motion: To table the CCPI report with the intent that representatives from the English Department and the Library get together to strengthen the course before this body takes it up again (Hamner/Wipperling)

MOTION APPROVED 20 YES – 0 NO – 0 ABSTENTIONS

C. Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)
(Katherine Perone, Chair)

1. Faculty Nominations

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Summer Bridge Program Task Force

Rebekah Buchanan, English
Pamela Peters, Broadcasting and Journalism

There were no further nominations, and the nominees were declared elected.

D. Ad Hoc Committee on Anti-Bullying Policies
(Cassandra Standberry, Chair)

1. Final Report

Cassandra Standberry, Executive Director of Human Resources, reminded senators that the ad hoc committee was created in Fall 2023 to address bullying in the workplace. She said the ad hoc committee was comprised of Senator Wipperling; Erin Fischer from Billing and Receivables, representing the Civil Service Employees Council; Honors College Dean Lorette Oden, representing the Council of Administrative Personnel; and herself as chair. Ms. Standberry was appointed by the Provost. She observed that currently there is no formal system in place to address workplace bullying, so the first step is to establish procedures, which are being created, as well as a plan to offer training across both campuses to ensure that everyone is aware of the new policy and how the process works.

Senator Hunter asked about a term used in the committee charge – “mobbing.” Chair Albarracin explained that some universities refer to bullying in this way, but the two terms are interchangeable.

Ms. Standberry pointed out that in the proposed grievance form employees will work with two to three levels of leadership with whom they will have the opportunity to resolve their grievance or complaint. She said Human Resources relies on Faculty Senate to assure that the process is consistent and fair throughout the university. Senator Perone asked if the hyperlinks in the documents would be activated once the policy is finalized; Ms. Standberry confirmed they will.

Dr. Filipink suggested that the form specify that this is the Employee Bullying Grievance Form so that it does not become confused with the grievance form used by the union. Ms. Standberry replied that anyone in a collective bargaining group who has a grievance regarding a contract violation will be directed to go to their union representative to file the grievance that way; anything outside of the contract would be filed through this form. She stated that the form will be used not just for bullying but for a number of complaints. Ms. Standberry said there are currently no metrics for the university, and Human Resources does not track employee complaints and grievances, which sometimes do not reach HR; this policy would provide a formal process which would include disciplinary actions for violations. Dr. Filipink asked if Human Resources will recommend that employees follow the grievance process specified under their collective bargaining agreement if they are a member of a

bargaining unit. Ms. Standberry confirmed this is correct if there is a violation of the collective bargaining contract, but if the violation is outside of the contract the employee should use the process being proposed so that Human Resources can track it across the university. She added that when the unions get involved over a contract violation, the problem does not reach Human Resources, but if there is a bullying policy violation, HR would like to use the proposed process to track it.

Chair Albarracin asked what would happen if there was a violation of the contract which also included bullying; she wonders whether there will be two parallel processes, with one being dealt with by the union and the other by HR. Ms. Standberry replied that is not the track she would like to follow. She does not think the contract addresses bullying, so a problem with bullying would not be addressed through the union but through the process being proposed. She stressed that this grievance form would be used by all employees and accessible to everyone. She thinks the form will help assure HR that they are being fair and consistent across the campuses.

Senator Ebert Wallace remarked that Ms. Standberry said the grievance form would be used for bullying and for other complaints as well. She asked for an example of something besides bullying that would not be directed to the union but handled through this process. Ms. Standberry pointed out that the form includes a box stating “I claim mistreatment based on (check all that apply)” and providing a list including bullying/mobbing, cyber bullying, retaliation, harassment, sexual harassment, hostile working environment, and other. Another box states that “I claim discrimination based on (check all that apply)” and lists age, gender, race, sex, pregnancy, veteran status, ancestry, disability, gender identity or expression, color, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, religion, or other. Ms. Standberry said another example might be when an employee expresses dissatisfaction with a performance evaluation, such as claiming a supervisor put things in the evaluation that did not happen as a form of retaliation. She said HR meets with both parties to talk things out and determine a resolution, and normally the supervisor accepts HR’s recommendations, and the issue is resolved. Ms. Standberry stated, though, that in order for HR to ensure fairness and see how they are operating as a whole university-wide, they need a formal process to track these complaints. She added that many times complaints are handled within departments and do not make it up to HR, but she wants to see how Human Resources is operating and how supervisors are managing complaints across the campuses. Senator Hunter asked where the form will reside on the WIU website. Ms. Standberry replied it will be included on the Human Resources website.

Chair Albarracin asked what the process would be if a chair assigned a faculty member something to teach, such as an extra course, without the appropriate compensation – but at the same time the chair called the faculty member names. Chair Albarracin thinks this would be an example of a situation that would not fall under the procedure being proposed but would instead fall under the oversight of the union, even though there would be bullying involved. Ms. Standberry responded she would encourage the employee to file grievances through both methods so that both complaints could be addressed. She added there can be two grievances filed simultaneously, one for contract violation and one for mistreatment that falls outside the contract. She added that the intention is to expand the resources for employees at all levels.

Senator Hunter asked if it could be made clear on the form that if employees are seeking a union-related grievance they should contact their union representative for assistance. Ms. Standberry responded this information will be included in the procedures, which will be shared with Faculty Senate at a later date, but they could also be added to the form as well.

Ms. Standberry told senators that Human Resources is also working on a Civility in the Workplace policy and a document on standards of conduct and how disciplinary actions are applied. She said this is all helping with transparency because WIU is not transparent enough. She said employees need to know their rights, but supervisors also need to know their rights

and that Human Resources is there to support them in their efforts to be strong leaders. She said HR wants to provide this support in a fair and consistent manner across the board.

Parliamentarian Robinett reminded senators that if they accept the ad hoc committee report, it will go to the President as is unless specific language is added in on the floor.

Dr. Filipink asked, in terms of discrimination complaints, whether this process will be parallel to the Equal Opportunity and Access process. Ms. Standberry replied that the form asks if the employee has filed a claim with the EOA office within the past 30 days because HR does not want to do double work. She added that oftentimes when employees file a claim with EOA it also comes to HR simultaneously. Ms. Standberry explained that when an employee files a grievance, they will do two things simultaneously: they will file the grievance with the first respondent and also submit it to HR. She said at this point HR will enter the information on a spreadsheet that they will use to track the grievance. HR will follow up within a certain number of days to make sure there is movement toward addressing the grievance and that everyone complies with the policy. Ms. Standberry said there may be some overlap between the HR and the EOA process, but that should be fine.

Dr. Filipink asked if there is a timetable to provide the procedures to accompany this proposed policy. Ms. Standberry hopes they can be provided within the next two weeks.

Motion: To table the proposal until the procedures are submitted for senators to review (Hunter/Petracovici)

MOTION APPROVED 17 YES – 1 NO – 0 ABSTENTIONS

Parliamentarian Robinett explained that, since it has been tabled, this item will come back as a report, including the procedures, and will follow the normal Senate process for approving a report from a council or committee. He asked if Ms. Standberry can add the additional statement that was discussed earlier when the proposal is brought back to Faculty Senate. She agreed to add the language on collective bargaining.

V. New Business

A. For the Good of the Body

Chair Albarracin expressed her thanks to the senators who attended in person. She recognizes that it is difficult to get used to attending meetings in person but asked that senators save the zoom option for those who really need it, such as a senator who breaks a leg, because otherwise there is a struggle for every meeting to achieve quorum.

Senator Gravitt provided an update on the Budget Transparency Committee, which has met and elected Senator Atherton as its chair. She said the committee has been told they will get the full budget for posting in April. Senator Gravitt was able to obtain salary information, which is public information and can be posted if anyone asks for it. She said the suggestion to obtain salary information came from former Senate Chair Bill Thompson, who suggested this would give the committee something to talk about while waiting for the full budget. She suggested that if anyone has questions about issues they would like for the committee to explore, they should send those to Senator Atherton.

Senator Perone asked how the faculty presentations at the recent Board of Trustees retreat went. Senator Gravitt replied it was longer than she had expected; faculty from the different colleges presented their information, and trustees asked them some questions. Chair Albarracin remarked the trustee questions were pretty perceptive. She has heard complaints from other groups who wanted to be invited to the retreat to make presentations, such as the Civil Service Employees Council. She said even the deans were unhappy they were not invited to present their ideas, but this is just a first step. She also thinks the administration will be implementing some of the faculty members' ideas. Interim

Provost Mossman added that Trustee Derek Wise complimented the presentations and thought faculty and the administration did a good job. Interim Provost Mossman observed that it is impossible to accommodate everyone, and there will always be groups left out, so he has heard some discontent. He said the idea is to encourage more open communication and hopes that more groups can present at future BOT retreats. Senator Gravitt agreed that trustees were definitely receptive. Senator Hamner remarked that one of the best things to come out of the faculty presentations to the BOT is that this apparently has not happened before, so this is something that should be celebrated because the more trust and cooperation that can be built, the better.

Senator Hamner related that Financial Aid Director Bobbi Smith met with the Executive Committee at their last meeting and pleaded that senators encourage their peers to complete the enrollment reporting process as much as possible because the financial health of the entire institution is at stake if they do not. He said the university can be in a bad situation very quickly if not enough faculty complete this process. He recognizes that this is one more thing faculty are being asked to do but encourages everyone to do this quickly at the beginning of the semester. Senator Gravitt remarked that faculty are also being asked to verify attendance at the end of the semester because not enough do it at the beginning. Senator Wipperling observed that there is also a question on the early warning grade system where faculty are asked to verify whether students have stopped participating or attending. Chair Albarracin said the discussion with ExCo also included differences between verifying academic activity for in-person versus online students. She said Ms. Smith will add some guidelines about verification of academic activity to the Financial Aid website to help faculty. Chair Albarracin said there is a way to verify if an online student watches a video, for example, which could be used to show academic activity even if the student did not submit a paper or take a quiz afterward. She noted that if a student sends an email to a faculty member asking questions of an academic nature, that can also be used to verify academic activity.

Motion: To adjourn (Gravitt)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary