

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Special Meeting, 30 April 2019, 4:00 p.m.
Union Capitol Rooms/WIUQC Complex 2203

ACTION MINUTES

SENATORS PRESENT: M. Allison, E. Asare, B. Bellott, V. Boynton, S. Cordes, S. Czechowski, R. Dimitrov, S. Macchi, M. Maskarinec, H. McIlvaine-Newsad, B. Perabo, J. Plos, C. Pynes, S. Rahman, C. Tarrant, K. Zbeeb (via teleconference)

Ex-officio: Russ Morgan, Associate Provost; Ilon Lauer, Parliamentarian

SENATORS ABSENT: G. Delany-Barmann, J. Franken, A. Hyde, F. Tasdan

GUESTS: Brad Bainter, Lori Baker-Sperry, Mark Bernards, Tom Blackford, Amy Carr, Drew Donahoo, Jack Elfrink, Tara Feld, Rich Filipink, Laura Frey, Anita Hardeman, Buzz Hoon, Angela Lynn, Colton Markey, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Rose McConnell, Kristi Mindrup (via teleconference), Mark Mossman, Jill Myers, Kat Myers, Rafael Obregon, Lorette Oden, Luciano Picanço, Bill Polley, Renee Polubinsky, Bill Pratt (via teleconference), Jeremy Robinett, Eric Sheffield, Ian Shelly, Darcie Shinberger, Amanda Silberer, Chad Sperry, Letisha Trepac, Gregg Woodruff

I. Consideration of Minutes

A. Closed Minutes of April 9, 2019

Chairperson Pynes remarked that the closed minutes do not appear on the Faculty Senate website but can be seen upon request.

CLOSED MINUTES APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED

II. Announcements

A. Provost's Report

Associate Provost Morgan filled in for Interim Provost Clow, who could not attend because of a scheduling conflict. Associate Provost Morgan also informed senators that President Thomas could not attend because he was called to Springfield for a couple of days to meet with legislators and testify on behalf of state universities in a press conference with Representative Ford. Associate Provost Morgan told senators there have been rumors from Springfield that there is a push from the legislature to make more cuts this year, and some state agencies have been told there is the potential for rescission. He added that so far state universities are exempted, and President Thomas is making sure that it stays that way.

Associate Provost Morgan announced that WIU has its third Goldwater Scholarship recipient. Mariah Dickson, a senior Biology major from Lockport, Illinois, was one of 495 students nationwide who received the award out of 1,223 students who were nominated. Associate Provost Morgan stated that these scholarships are intended to allow STEM majors to continue their education. He told senators that Honors College Dean Rick Hardy and English professor Bill Knox were helpful in getting Ms. Dickson prepared and nominating her for the scholarship. He added that the University is very proud of her.

Supply Chain Management students placed second at the Case competition at Iowa State last week. The WIU Wind Ensemble will present their 52nd President's Concert at 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, May 4 in the COFAC Recital Hall.

Senator Rahman observed that the University has had two interim provosts for the past five years; she wonders if WIU will get an actual provost anytime this year. Chairperson Pynes corrected that it has only been four years that WIU has had interim provosts; Senator Rahman remarked that an interim should only be in place for one year. Chairperson Pynes related that

on Friday, April 26, emails were sent to the provost candidates to ask their permission to conduct background checks, and President Thomas told Faculty Senate last week that they were engaged in this process. The President has said that he will make his decision as soon as he receives the results. Chairperson Pynes does not know how quick the turn-around time is for the background checks; Faculty Senate earlier in the year received a report from Digger Oster showing that only one person was refused employment due to a background check out of the almost 2,500 that have been completed, so Chairperson Pynes does not anticipate a problem and expects a decision soon. Senator Boynton asked if it is expected that a decision will be made this semester; Chairperson Pynes replied that he hopes so, but the candidate may negotiate. He related that the Board of Trustees (BOT) process requires that President Thomas inform Faculty Senate in executive session, as well as informing the search committee. Chairperson Pynes is confident that WIU will have a non-interim provost next year. Associate Provost Morgan added that he is confident about this as well.

Senator Bellott asked if Dietetics has been removed from the Academic Program Elimination Review (APER) list. Associate Provost Morgan responded that it has, and the three faculty members have been taken off of the layoff list as well. Senator Allison asked how many total faculty members have been taken off of the layoff list. Associate Provost Morgan replied there has been a lot of movement because of retirements and resignations and because of the removal of Dietetics faculty. He said it is not clear why Dietetics was on the list to begin with. Associate Provost Morgan stated that, as a ballpark figure, he knows of six or seven faculty at this point that have been taken off of the layoff list, including the three from Dietetics.

Senator Cordes asked if the University has looked into using anyone similar to the Thorburn Group to consult on marketing, as they called in Noel-Levitz consultants in the past. Associate Provost Morgan replied that the University just hired a Marketing Director a year ago that is doing a great job, but he does not know what her future plans are for the University. Vice President for Advancement and Public Services Brad Bainter added that his office just hired a firm out of Greenville, South Carolina called Up&Up that specializes in marketing, branding, and rebranding in higher education only. He added that hiring this firm was carved out of the marketing budget.

Senator Perabo asked Associate Provost Morgan to clarify what he meant by stating that it is not clear why Dietetics was on the APER list in the first place. Associate Provost Morgan replied that Dietetics's former department, the Department of Dietetics, Fashion Merchandising, and Hospitality (DFMH), was broken up about a year and a half ago into the programs of Dietetics, Nutrition, Hospitality Management, and Fashion Merchandising. He explained that when the department was broken up, some students were in Dietetics and some were still finishing up the old Family and Consumer Sciences major which preceded it; the administration did some investigation and found that when these two groups were combined, they were actually at the 40 threshold for APER review. Associate Provost Morgan told senators that he and Interim Provost Clow have been meeting individually with each person on the layoff list and with their departments; they went over the data and decided that Dietetics should no longer be on the list. Senator Perabo asked when it was determined that Dietetics should not be on the list – as early as October, or as late as February – because three faculty were still given layoff notices. Associate Provost Morgan replied that it was not determined until he and Interim Provost Clow met with Dietetics faculty after the APER report.

Chairperson Pynes remarked that if the argument for removing Dietetics is that they merged were moved into another area, and are getting to count other things, he does not understand why Religious Studies professor Sarah Haynes and faculty in African American Studies were laid off since they were also moved into a program (Liberal Arts and Sciences) which is significantly above 40. Associate Provost Morgan replied that in looking at the APER numbers it was determined that the Dietetics program would no longer be eliminated, and because the program is no longer being eliminated, the faculty were taken off the layoff list. He added that the numbers APER had did not include all of the Dietetics majors. Chairperson Pynes observed that Liberal Arts and Sciences was not on the APER list, and faculty in that major were laid off because of a continuation of program eliminations from 2015-16, even

though they are now in a program with significantly more than 40 majors (since they have 80). He wonders what the justification is if the Liberal Arts and Sciences program is stable and has close to 100 majors. He believes this is causing confusion when faculty talk about being unable to rationalize the layoffs or to reconstruct how these decisions were made; this inconsistency concerns people, especially faculty in Liberal Arts and Sciences who now only have two weeks left of work before their layoffs take effect. He observed that Safoura Boukari, JoAnn Morgan, and Sarah Haynes were laid off from that department even though it has far more majors than necessary.

Associate Provost Morgan explained there are two different types of layoffs: some are due to program elimination while others are tied to low enrollment. He added that the layoffs determined last summer were not as a result of program eliminations but were tied to low enrollment. Chairperson Pynes asked if nearly 100 majors is considered low enrollment. He pointed out that those faculty are part of the Department of Liberal Arts and Sciences now, just like Dietetics moved from DFMH to a new department. He thinks this is a natural follow-up question and that everyone is waiting for an explanation.

Senator Allison observed that, looking at documents obtained through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), it can be seen that Sociology, Anthropology, and History are all listed for major eliminations while continuing Gen Ed courses, which makes her head feel like exploding. Chairperson Pynes explained Senator Allison is referring to the proposed reorganization plan given to the BOT last June that was originally to have been implemented this year and which proposed to eliminate these majors. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad corrected that the document did not propose eliminating the Anthropology major; it proposed taking all of the Anthropology courses off of the books, which is a completely different motive for having this program included on the APER list, even though Anthropology has been trotted out time after time as innovative, creative, and garnering new majors.

Senator Allison recalled that last week senators were given the positive news that WIU's fall numbers are looking good; she assumes these numbers are being looked at every day since tomorrow is National Signing Day for many academic institutions. She wonders if Admissions has an update since it is seven days since the last information was reported to Senate. Admissions Program Coordinator Drew Donahoo responded that last Friday's totals (which is how often numbers are run) showed just under 4,000 accepted students for Fall 2018, but that data continues to grow; there are now 600 students signed up for Summer Orientation and Registration (SOAR), and last Friday that number was 537, so it has grown quite a bit. He added that housing contracts stand at 435. Mr. Donahoo explained that WIU does not require a May 1 decision, although many schools do and WIU welcomes students that make their decisions by then. He said the Admissions Office phones and emails have been very busy, probably because students assume that WIU requires a decision by May 1. Mr. Donahoo told senators that this morning Admissions sent out a final round of scholarship offers to students not eligible for the Western Commitment scholarship as a last push to grab some more students for fall. He promised that Admissions will continue to work with students as they get their final offers from other institutions and make their final decisions in order to get them into orientation programs at WIU in June, work with advisors in July, and move in in August. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that WIU has three streams for enrollment: undergraduate admissions, graduate admissions, and international student admissions, run out of the School of Global Education and Outreach. Senator Boynton asked how these numbers compare to this time last year. Mr. Donahoo replied that overall acceptances are down 24 percent, but other indicators are up; SOAR registrations are up 11 percent and housing contracts are up three percent. He said this indicates that while fewer students are being accepted, the University is doing a better job of converting them into coming to WIU. Chairperson Pynes observed that one reason there are fewer applications is because WIU is no longer using the Common App. He added that there are always lots of variables when projecting future enrollment.

Senator Czechowski remarked that it concerns her, as well as with Senators Perabo, Rahman, and Allison, when she thinks about the timeline over the past couple of years in light of the FOIA documents and how faculty are being told not to create negative press, when now she is

hearing that a program should not even be on the APER list. She observed that there are conversations about low faculty morale, but at the same time WIU has been laying off tenured faculty; while it is wonderful that three to six faculty are coming off of the layoff list, a lot of damage has already been done because with faculty being laid off and then brought back, they are always scared that it will happen again. She believes the feeling surrounding the layoffs is like post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Senator Czechowski remarked that when she hears that a program should not have been on the APER list, it makes her think the administration should take people's lives and careers more seriously because she knows how much it affected her life and those of many other faculty who were on a layoff list and then taken off of it, and there are many who have not been taken off of it yet. She stressed that these faculty are passionate about what they do and show up to teach every day, but their lives and careers are affected by these decisions. She pointed out that faculty asked for more time for the APER report, but the administration wanted to get it done quicker. She thinks if the APER Committee had been given sufficient time to get everything done and complete all of its research, the administration would not be in the position of having to pull faculty back off of layoff.

Senator Allison completely agrees with Senator Czechowski that faculty have PTSD; everybody is trying to figure out the numbers game, but the numbers keep changing so it is impossible to figure them out. She wonders if it is the complete set of faculty in the Department of Liberal Arts and Sciences that matter or if it is only the minors that matter. She also wonders whether it will harm the Department of English if it merges with Department of Liberal Arts and Sciences. She wonders why English would throw the dice when they do not know what will happen with the numbers, or which numbers matter and which do not. Senator Allison recalled that faculty were told for years that student credit hour (SCH) production was the gold standard, then it became majors; she noted that SCH still seems to be important – until a department has too many Gen Ed classes, which is bad, and there are a lot of departments that teach a lot of Gen Ed. She thinks that no one has a goal because no one seems to know what the University is aiming toward – SCH, majors, both, or neither. She wonders if the goal is to get rid of enough tenured faculty so that programs can be offered cheaper and noted that English will not be cheap until most of its current faculty are gone because most of them have been around for quite a while. She asked if the determination is based on dollars, a specific number, or SCH. Associate Provost Morgan replied that the number of majors, SCH, and degrees conferred are the major factors because these are the numbers the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) looks for when determining low productivity.

Senator Dimitrov asked if the FOIA document contains the percentage of SCH for WIUQC and online. Associate Provost Morgan replied that he has not seen the document and is not familiar with it. Chairperson Pynes stated that the BOT has seen it. Senator Dimitrov asked if the SCH production for Quad Cities and online courses are also factors in these decisions. Associate Provost Morgan replied that they are not that he is aware of.

B. Student Government Association Report
(Colton Markey, SGA Director of Academic Affairs)

Mr. Markey reported that WIU Sustainability Committee representatives came to SGA to propose a bike share program, which will be voted on at the SGA meeting tonight. Senator Allison asked if there was formerly a program at WIU. Mr. Markey thinks there was formerly a program, but he does not know what happened to it. He thinks the new program will be a little different.

C. Other Announcements

1. President Thomas

The President was called to Springfield and unable to attend the meeting.

2. Chairperson Pynes asked for those senators who may have large manila envelopes in their offices to send them to the Faculty Senate office where they will be reused to send packets next year.
3. Chairperson Pynes expressed his thanks to Faculty Senate Recording Secretary and Office Manager Annette Hamm for her work on behalf of Faculty Senate, coordinating CCPI, and serving for the second year in a row on the Provost Search Committee, which had many early and late meetings.
4. Chairperson Pynes thanked the outgoing senators for their service: Marjorie Allison, Edmund Asare, Andrea Hyde, Stacey Macchi, Heather McIlvaine-Newsad, Jennifer Plos, and Cecil Tarrant. He expressed his hope that outgoing senators will continue to serve WIU in the same honorable way that they have served Faculty Senate.
5. Chairperson Pynes read into the minutes the following resolution to recognize a special retiring senator:

**Resolution in Recognition of Exceptional Service by
Dr. Virginia “Ginny” R. Boynton,
Senator and Nominating Committee Chair of the Faculty Senate, 2015-2019**

RATIONALE

WHEREAS, Dr. Boynton has won four Senate elections representing both the College of Arts and Sciences and all Faculty as an at-large Senator serving a total of ten years on the Western Illinois University Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Boynton has distinguished herself with the longest continuous term of service as the Faculty Senate Nominating Committee Chair (from 2015-2019) in the history of the Western Illinois University Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Boynton has provided exemplary leadership and service to the Faculty Senate in her capacity as both a Senator and the Nominating Committee Chair; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Boynton has performed in an outstanding manner as spokesperson for faculty, students, and the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Boynton’s commitment to the ideals of shared faculty governance will serve as a long-lasting model for future Senators and Chairs of the Nominating Committee; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Boynton is a devoted and loyal Detroit Tigers fan, supporter of Tri-States Public Radio, the Department of History, History Education, and the Western Illinois University Faculty Senate.

RESOLUTION

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate of Western Illinois University hereby officially recognizes Dr. Virginia “Ginny” R. Boynton for her distinguished service to the Faculty Senate and to Western Illinois University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT this Resolution be permanently recorded in, and distributed via, the Minutes of the Western Illinois University Faculty Senate.

III. Reports of Committees and Councils

A. Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction (CCPI)

(Anita Hardeman, Chair)

1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction

a. Request for New Course

i. SPED 410, Senior Seminar in Special Education, 0 s.h.

Senator Perabo asked if this new course is taken alongside another accredited course. Curriculum and Instruction Chair Laura Frey responded affirmatively, adding that it coincides with the student teaching semester. Senator Perabo asked why this course is not simply incorporated as part of the other course and why it is 0 s.h. instead of something else. Dr. Frey responded that there is already an ECH 410, which is offered in the semester where students do their student teaching in early childhood education, and ELED 410, which is intended for students completing elementary education, but there has never been a SPED 410. She explained that 410 courses are designed to provide a touchstone point, and faculty who are assigned to teach these courses are experts in their discipline and in the edTPA, the portfolio component that all student teachers are required to complete before they graduate. She said student teaching supervisors do not oversee the edTPA; instead, a faculty in the discipline area is assigned to be the touchstone. Dr. Frey stated that SPED 410 was not an issue when there were still PAA points, but it has now been discovered that there is an inequality in the structure because a faculty member can be assigned to ECH 410 and ELED 410 and get credit for those, but the person teaching Special Ed must be a volunteer. She added that the department chose to not use ECH 410 or ELED 410 because they wanted to be able to provide a faculty member with expertise in special education to teach this course since each of the edTPA portfolios is unique to the components of that particular edTPA experience. Senator Perabo found this explanation helpful.

NEW COURSE APPROVED

b. Request for Change of Major

i. Special Education

Senator Dimitrov asked if the difference of 8 s.h. between the existing 131 s.h. major and the proposed 123 s.h. major comes from removing two courses in section 5, Other, and one course in section 2, Core Courses. Dr. Frey confirmed this is correct; the department was seeking a reduction for the major semester hours.

CHANGE OF MAJOR APPROVED

B. Council on Admission, Graduation, and Academic Standards
(Rich Filipink, Chair)

1. Proposal to Eliminate FYE as a Graduation Requirement

Chairperson Pynes told senators that they should have received in their packets a recommendation from CAGAS, a report from the Faculty Senate's ad hoc FYE Program Review Committee, a recommendation from the Provost's office, and a response from Senator Macchi. He asked Interim Associate Provost Mark Mossman to present the Provost's office proposal and its justification first. Interim Associate

Provost Mossman stated that, simply put, the proposal is not to eliminate the First Year Experience (FYE) program; it is a proposal to eliminate the graduation requirement for UNIV 100 in the FYE program. He explained that as it currently stands, UNIV 100 operates at the center of the FYE program; by eliminating the UNIV 100 graduation requirement, it is hoped that the FYE program can be refocused and anchored to the Y courses, which are usually General Education courses which provide an introduction to their disciplines and the academic content for FYE. Interim Associate Provost Mossman stated that this will enable the program to re-center faculty involvement since very few faculty teach UNIV 100; by placing the focus on Y courses, it is hoped to revitalize those courses and the way faculty are functioning in the FYE program. He added that it is important to note that making this change will build a foundation for the evolution of the First Year Experience program because it will rely on faculty expertise as it moves forward with everything from FYE program assessment to the development of the entire program. Chairperson Pynes recalled that FYE originated as two Y courses in about 2008-09; Faculty Senate made it a graduation requirement that students complete two Y courses. He recalled that was then changed to keep one 3 s.h. Y course and add a 1 s.h. UNIV 100 course as the second requirement. He noted that the current proposal is to eliminate UNIV 100 as a graduation requirement but to keep the graduation requirement of one 3 s.h. Y course. Interim Associate Provost Mossman confirmed this is correct.

Senator Boynton remarked that she has not taught an FYE course for a long time; she formerly taught HIST 106Y. She noted that students who take HIST 106 or HIST 106Y are expected to cover the same 3 s.h. of history, but she wonders if there will be additional material in HIST 106Y that students will be expected to do. She asked if the remaining UNIV 100 course content will be moved into the Y courses but students will not get any additional credit for it. Interim Associate Provost Mossman responded that UNIV 100 functions well for certain students, which is why the decision was made to recommend retaining the course so that it can be available for Office of Academic Services (OAS) students who can benefit from its discussions of note taking, larger health issues, etc. He explained the goal is not to impinge on any disciplinary content but to use peer mentors to help with various aspects, primarily focusing on the big picture issues of mentoring, developing relationships, and developing identification with the institution and with learning. He stated that all of these will happen with the peer mentors in the classrooms and with online modules, which will also be assisted by the peer mentors. He believes the key to the new approach is flexibility – not to have 16 steps with all steps having to be met, but instead to rely on Y instructors to help figure out the best use of the peer mentors and the delivery of the course content and big picture items where freshmen will identify with the institution and with the discipline. Senator Boynton asked if this means that peer mentors will be returned to the Y classes instead of the UNIV 100 classes; Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that peer mentors will help with both.

Senator McIlvaine-Newsad asked if majors that are fully online will have these options as well; she does not see how students that are only enrolled in Sociology, Liberal Arts and Sciences, or Anthropology online will be able to fulfill their graduation requirements because there is no online FYE option. Interim Associate Provost Mossman agreed that is a good point and something that needs to be worked on as the FYE program evolves since this will also be an issue for UNIV 100. He explained that part of the purpose of the proposal is to acknowledge that WIU's student population is becoming increasingly diverse, with 11.3 percent now completely online students. He noted that there also are a large number of students enrolling in WIU with many credits earned through dual enrollment, dual credit, or AP coursework. Interim Associate Provost Mossman told senators the whole purpose of the proposal is to have an FYE program that is able to be flexible enough to handle those questions. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad related that she has taught in the FYE program since the very beginning, and they are some of her favorite classes because they are small and allow her to teach Anthropology in a way that is more one-on-one.

She believes she could problem solve how to resolve the online problem for her program, but she would want an ACE or monetary compensation for the time needed to figure this out. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad clarified that if she needs to include another layer of materials, she is happy to do that, but she wants the administration to acknowledge that this is taking a significant amount of time on the part of instructors teaching these classes, and there needs to be some way to recognize this because it will take some creativity to solve. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that he does not disagree at all.

Senator Dimitrov said he is hearing the change would mean that FYE would go more into the disciplines and become a tool for recruiting majors, and he wonders whether this would mean that programs in departments that do not teach Y courses will be at a disadvantage. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that he does not know and has not thought about that. FYE Faculty Associate Lori Baker-Sperry added that the question that usually comes up is what the disadvantages would be for departments teaching FYE because of the smaller classes, but she agrees that they can be a faculty recruitment tool. Senator Dimitrov asked if they would be considered recruitment tools only for majors in specific areas. Dr. Baker-Sperry replied that they could be considered recruitment tools for disciplines that have primarily first year students who may be undeclared. She added that no courses have been excluded from the list of those that have traditionally been taught as Y courses. Interim Associate Provost Mossman remarked that Y courses are normally General Education courses, but there have been some Y courses that are not Gen Ed. He encourages disciplines to develop Y courses and offered to work with those areas.

Senator Macchi told senators that working in FYE is a very difficult job, as she, Interim Associate Provost Mossman, and Dr. Baker-Sperry can attest, since FYE has so many moving parts and pieces. One of her major concerns with the proposal is that the FYE program when it began had a two Y course model; prior to 2013, Y courses had co-curriculars and peer mentors, which is included in the current proposal. She noted that peer mentors were intended to help instructors do those kinds of transitional things that those overseeing the First Year Experience wanted it to do. Senator Macchi related that in 2011-13, an FYE Review Committee found that faculty were not doing those transitional types of things; knowing that, the decision was made to move away from that model because faculty were not necessarily doing what FYE was intended to do. She explained that the decision was made to switch to one UNIV 100 and one Y course because transition-related things were not being covered, peer mentors were being used differently, and co-curricular activities were not aligned across course sections. Senator Macchi observed that this proposal is very like the last iteration of FYE, and there are many overlapping components between the two. Her biggest question is why Faculty Senate should be in favor of going back to this model when no review was done, not all of the stakeholders were talked to, and there is no justification as to why the current program cannot be tweaked or reworked.

Interim Associate Provost Mossman thanked Senator Macchi for acknowledging the complexity of the FYE program; he agrees there are a lot of moving parts. He thinks it is a problem that faculty members are not directly involved in the first year experience of students coming to WIU. He also does not think a good job has been done since the beginning of FYE of assessing the way it works. Interim Associate Provost Mossman related that the first co-curricular assessment of student learning meeting was held yesterday, which brought people across the institution to begin to do this kind of work. He believes that even if the learning outcomes in Academic Affairs and Student Services are not the same, one can at least see how those learning outcomes can connect and be able to measure and assess their effectiveness, which works directly with the FYE program. Interim Associate Provost Mossman stressed that the foundation for any first year experience program needs to be the faculty; his role is to establish an environment where that kind of work can succeed. Regarding enrollment management, for example, Interim Associate Provost Mossman proposes intervening

now rather than in August; he has spoken with all of the chairs assigning Y courses for the fall to make sure that they are all level, so that one course does not have 32 students and another only three. He believes this kind of work needs to happen so that the FYE program can rely on faculty expertise to move the program forward.

Interim Associate Provost Mossman stated that he and other representatives from FYE leadership have spoken to at least 198 individuals about the proposed changes to FYE, from President Thomas to SGA, so they have tried to be as inclusive as possible. Senator Macchi asked if they met with everyone who teaches Y courses to ask them about their feelings regarding the proposal. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that meetings are planned with these faculty members over the next couple of weeks. Senator Macchi stated that she is a Y instructor and has not received an email regarding a meeting. She asked if Y instructors were provided with the proposal and asked for their feedback; Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that they were not, but this is part of the process being engaged in across the entire institution.

Senator Macchi remarked that Faculty Senate asks for a lot of justification for various things, starting with the reorganization last summer; the Senate wanted to know the justification behind those proposals and why things are being done. She recalled that last week Faculty Senate asked for justification for the layoffs, and the process of reorganization tended to slow down so that all stakeholders could have the opportunity for input on the current situation before moving forward. Senator Macchi sees a very distinct parallel between that and the push to get the FYE proposal approved so that the changes can be started in Fall 2019, but she is concerned that all peer mentors, advisors, and Y instructors have not been spoken to about these changes. She asked the reason for the push. Dr. Baker-Sperry replied that this time last year, when Senator Macchi was the FYE Faculty Associate and Nancy Parsons was the Associate Provost, Faculty Senate requested retention evidence from the FYE program. She explained that it is very difficult with the way the FYE program has developed to produce that evidence, but it has been requested for years, so that is part of the impetus for moving forward. She stated that while the group that crafted the proposal has not gone to every person's door, they have taken each person's responses into account, and she has pages of notes from the meetings that have occurred so far and from those who have contacted FYE leadership to provide input. Dr. Baker-Sperry asserted that if the University continues to work within the current FYE system and talk to people another one to three years, there will continue to not be any sort of measurable evidence for student retention. She thinks that with the current amount of money that is being put into the program, FYE can and should move forward.

Dr. Baker-Sperry stressed that the proposal is not to remove FYE but to tweak some components so that some measurable data can be generated. She pointed out that right now the entire population takes UNIV 100, and it is very hard to assess data when the entire population takes the same course, but if UNIV 100 is taken out and made into a course that is encouraged for some students through advising, it will provide a control group. She noted that there is a lot of evidence that self-selection is not statistically significant, so if the proposal is approved then students who took UNIV 100 can be compared with those that did not sign up for it who have some of the same variables. She admitted that this may not be the complete answer to the problem, but she hopes to come back to Faculty Senate next year to talk about ways move forward again. Dr. Baker-Sperry told senators that she has been at WIU for 20 years, and it is very easy to talk for a decade rather than move forward; this is not a justification for moving quickly, but WIU at this time needs to do everything it can to retain students and be able to measure in as many ways possible.

Chairperson Pynes recalled that he was one of the people that asked for justification of FYE and for retention data. He is surprised that a decade later there is no proof that FYE helps retention because that was one of the justifications used to sell faculty on the program. He observed that the University is now 15 years into the program and ten

years after people asked for proof of dollars spent and return on investment in the form of retention data, and the answer to that is to propose a new tweak to the program that will finally allow for determination of retention efforts. Dr. Baker-Sperry reiterated that the proposed changes will allow for FYE leadership to begin moving forward, and they are already starting to work with a few measurable models. She stated that some of the models deal with the Y class, which all students will be required to take, and some with UNIV 100, which students will be able to self-select or be advised to take. She related that there is a lot of national data that FYE is helpful and successful, and there is a lot of anecdotal student data, so she is not saying that it was unsuccessful in the past; she is simply trying to explain what the FYE leadership is trying to do. Chairperson Pynes remarked that generally the FYE models that he has seen which were successful were funded significantly more than WIU's model. He added that one reason he is sympathetic to the elimination of most of WIU's FYE program is because he does not think it is properly funded, and if it is not properly funded it will not work well.

Senator Rahman found Senator Macchi's statement about faculty not doing what they were supposed to do in their Y classes rather offensive. Senator Rahman had a peer mentor for her Y class, did co-curricular activities, and did her job in the Y course, as well as having taught a UNIV 100 course. She tried to make the Y course work with UNIV 100 and did what she was supposed to do, so she takes offense to Senator Macchi's assertion. She does not think she takes offense just because she is a faculty member who is not treated with the respect that she deserves due to her expertise but also because we live in a culture that does not respect expertise in general. Senator Rahman pointed out that our culture thinks it is okay to use an Uber driver rather than a taxi driver, or to see a nurse practitioner rather than a doctor, and she is tired of it – not just as a Ph.D. with 17 years of experience at this institution but as someone who is frustrated in general with this way of thinking.

Senator Cordes, who chaired the Faculty Senate's ad hoc FYE Program Review Committee, questions the exponential use of peer mentors. He pointed out that page 2 of the Provost's office proposal states that "peer mentors will facilitate the application of skills-based learning in the Y course." Senator Cordes related that in his UNIV 100 course, the peer mentor attends one class and meets with him for two to three hours per week, less time that would be put in by a student worker. He noted that "the application of skills-based learning" seems to imply that peer mentors would have to have these skills and be able to apply them. He pointed out that page 2 also indicates that peer mentors must "work collaboratively" with Y faculty and Building Connections mentors and must "meet one-on-one with students." He observed that page 4 also lists "supplemental study items for the course, likewise provided by the peer mentor and identified as needed"; in Y courses "with the help of the peer mentor, students will reflect on their own learning processes and develop an awareness of their role in the WIU community"; and that "It is the expectation that Peer Mentors will manage and instruct students in this material [specific electronic components built for Western Online] and use it to assist the professor as requested." Senator Cordes thinks this sounds like a large menu of responsibilities for the peer mentors. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that it is a menu; one of the core principles of the program is to give faculty the opportunity to develop their relationships with peer mentors. He stressed that different disciplines will handle peer mentors in different ways; this is not an inventory or a job description but is better described as a menu, and the peer mentor *may* do certain items from this list. Senator Cordes asked how it will be assessed whether peer mentors are doing these items and that they are effective. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that he believes in communication and relationships, and the goal is for peer mentors to meet with Y instructors to develop a community. He added that everyone will try to be on the same page moving forward, recognizing that they all share a cohort of freshmen students.

Senator Cordes stated that the assessment portion is his biggest concern; he pointed out that the numbers are available and are included in the ad hoc committee's report, but the problem that has been encountered in the past and that continues is that there is not consistent data collection across the sections. Interim Associate Provost Mossman agrees that there has been remarkably inconsistent data collection and assessment of the existing FYE program. When Interim Associate Provost Mossman first came into his current position, he heard that FYE is not about retention, but there is a document from 2010 that says the number one purpose for FYE is to retain students. Dr. Baker-Sperry confirmed this is in one of the original documents; she sat on Faculty Senate when the First Year Experience was first proposed and recalled that senators at that time looked at a lot of iterations of documents, goals, and expected outcomes. She recalled that the document Chairperson Pynes referred to was dated 2010 and had a list of items under the heading "FYE will do..." Chairperson Pynes reiterated that the way the FYE program was sold to senators as a graduation requirement was that it would help the University to retain students. Interim Associate Provost Mossman agreed that there needs to be a way to measure if this is actually working. Chairperson Pynes expressed astonishment that it is now 15 years that the program has been operational and a decade after Faculty Senate asked for this data and the program has still not shown proof of meeting its number one goal. Senator Macchi clarified that before the 2011-13 FYE review this goal was included in documentation, but after the review it was no longer included because the goals for FYE had been changed.

Senator Macchi told Senator Rahman she did not mean for her words to be taken as a personal attack and was referring to one of the findings of the report from 2013. She added that she also teaches Y courses and did not mean to offend Senator Rahman in any way.

Senator Macchi remarked, as a follow-up to Senator Cordes's statements, that FYE literature lists one of the most important factors as the relationship between peer mentors and faculty mentors, which makes the class so much more enriching for students. She did not see in the documentation provided by the Provost's office that faculty will have the ability to pick their peer mentors. She noted that this has always been a staple of FYE, and she definitely wants a peer mentor who knows the material for the class because she would not feel comfortable asking a peer mentor to do anything content related if that student was not familiar with the course. She wants to know if faculty can hand pick peer mentors as they have done in the past because faculty have a good relationship with these students already. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that ideally the new FYE program would develop a hybrid model. He informed senators that this year the FYE program used students from the Western Leadership Program. He related that when he taught his first Y course he had a peer mentor who was a Nursing major, and the experience was excellent, even though she did not have any interest in majoring in English. He explained that ideally both kinds of peer mentors will be used, but warned that it will take time to figure out how to implement that model. Dr. Baker-Sperry pointed out that currently Y courses are not offered across the University; if Senator Macchi's peer mentor is limited to someone majoring in Communication, there will be students across the University who are not offered the opportunity to serve as peer mentors. Senator Boynton pointed out that all students must take Communication to graduate. Senator Macchi clarified that she meant that she would like to have a peer mentor who has taken her Communication class, not necessarily a Communication major. Dr. Baker-Sperry pointed out that peer mentors do not teach course content. Senator Macchi agrees that they should not but pointed out that the proposal states a number of times that peer mentors "instruct," and they are not teaching assistants. Dr. Baker-Sperry confirmed that peer mentors support the course in many ways but are not teaching assistants. Senator Macchi asked again if faculty teaching Y courses this fall will be able to pick their peer mentors; Dr. Baker-Sperry replied that they cannot. She explained that the plan for this fall, if the proposal is approved, is that Y and UNIV 100 instructors, as well as peer mentors, will be surveyed to try to identify expectations for the courses. She said the survey will ask

questions such as “Do you feel comfortable standing in front of a class,” “Would you like to work with students one-on-one behind the scenes,” “How comfortable are you with Western Online,” and “What would be your expectations for a peer mentor in terms of offering things like tutoring support or resources for tutoring.” Dr. Baker-Sperry recalled that Senator Macchi trained her when she began as the FYE Faculty Associate to recognize the importance of scheduling, so that needs to be in place, too.

Interim Associate Provost Mossman stressed that it is important to let FYE evolve because it is a process; the proposal is a foundation to re-center the program so that faculty become more involved in the mechanization of FYE. He does not want the program to be so rigid that it goes another three years without changing, and admitted that chances are he and Dr. Baker-Sperry will be back to Faculty Senate next year with an additional request for another model for the program. Interim Associate Provost Mossman said that, in his opinion, this should occur every year.

CAGAS Chair Rich Filipink related, in response to Senator Cordes’s remarks, that the Council extensively discussed the expectations for peer mentors. He stated that, like Senator Cordes, CAGAS’s concerns were that the laundry list looked like requirements for peer mentors in return for a relatively paltry compensation. Dr. Filipink related that he served on CAGAS when FYE was first proposed on 2008-09, and the University President at that time ran the proposal around CAGAS when the Council asked for assessment data. He related that CAGAS was told that FYE would be impossible to assess, and as a result the Council did not want FYE as a graduation requirement. He recalled that the proposal for a First Year Experience graduation requirement came before Faculty Senate at a special meeting, much like today. Dr. Filipink stated that CAGAS does not buy the excuse that FYE is not an assessable program, and they believe that assessment data needs to be completed; in fact, Dr. Filipink believes there should be 15 years of assessment data. Chairperson Pynes agrees, or would like to see at least a decade of data since this was requested a decade ago by Faculty Senate. Interim Associate Provost Mossman promised there will be assessment data next year. He also pointed out that CAGAS voted in favor of the Provost’s office proposal this year.

Senator Dimitrov asked what will be assessed. Dr. Baker-Sperry responded that work has begun on an assessment of student learning plan that would identify goals and a way to assess them, both in the Y courses and in UNIV 100. Dr. Baker-Sperry told senators that she has been doing assessment for 15 years and would be happy to share what has been developed so far. She observed that sometimes assessment is used in different ways; when she refers to assessment, she means assessment of student learning in the classroom, but she thinks it is also very important to be able to show that the program is effective in the ways that it is stated it should be. She observed that if the desire is to have the FYE program be successful in assisting retention, this may not necessarily dovetail with assessment of student learning. She thinks measures need to be developed that at least allow the FYE program to navigate this question: “What kind of program would support WIU student retention in this given time?” She pointed out that the students taking FYE courses ten years ago are different than today’s students, so this should be a continuing process.

Interim Associate Provost Mossman told senators that FYE leadership has established a co-curricular committee to develop shared outcomes that they can specifically measure. He added that many, but not all, Y courses are Gen Ed courses, so assessment data is already “baked in.” He said the goal is to think this process through and develop a model where FYE leadership can measure things the way they actually claim they can. Interim Associate Provost Mossman stated that the assessment model used by Stephen F. Austin State University in Texas seems to work fairly well.

Senator Boynton asked if senators are supposed to be considering removing UNIV 100 as a graduation requirement or elimination of the FYE requirement. Chairperson

Pynes stated that while the Senate agenda in error listed consideration of elimination of the FYE graduation requirement, what Faculty Senate is actually considering is the CAGAS report, which recommends adopting the Provost's office proposal to eliminate the UNIV 100 graduation requirement, not the entire FYE program.

Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration professor Jeremy Robinett told senators, in addition to teaching Y courses and UNIV 100, he has served on the FYE Leadership Team for a number of years, and they first saw this proposal on February 15. He related they asked questions regarding the increasing involvement of peer mentors and if they would be instructors in any capacity. He said the FYE Leadership Team thinks if peer mentors are required to perform a number of the listed activities, it will change the substance of the course. He related that Team members asked about credit hours for Y courses versus non-Y courses and how the various activities would be assessed. He wonders, if the peer mentor is going to be attending the activities, whether the peer mentor will also be grading these things, or if this is something the faculty member will be asked to do. Dr. Robinett told senators that the Leadership Team did not receive a response to their questions, but on March 22 they were provided with a revised plan. He stated that the entire FYE team has not met since February 15; the proposal that senators received is very similar to the proposal the FYE Leadership Team received on February 15, and none of the issues they raised have been identified or further clarified. He noted that senators are asking the same kinds of questions that the FYE Leadership Team asked. Dr. Robinett supports that change is needed to the FYE program, but he does not think the University should go forward with something that has not been identified and is not generally understood.

Senator McIlvaine-Newsad remarked that with any new proposal that comes forward, such as curricular changes or requests for new majors, she always asks about the complexity and the completeness of the packet of materials provided to senators. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad believes that anything can be assessed, but in the materials provided by the Provost's office she does not see any assessment data or any plans regarding future assessment, and that makes her uneasy. She related that when the new online Anthropology major was proposed ten years ago, Senator McIlvaine-Newsad had to provide how she was going to gather data about that program, and there are all kinds of ways that data can be collected. She is not sure how Faculty Senate can move forward on the proposal when it is a very incomplete packet. Chairperson Pynes suggested that Dr. Filipink could relate how CAGAS came to their conclusions. He told senators the Senate Executive Committee sent the proposal to CAGAS since they consider questions of graduation standards, and Faculty Senate takes recommendations from its councils and committees seriously. He pointed out that a council that Faculty Senate relies on has spent more time on this proposal than senators have, so while he does not disagree with Senator McIlvaine-Newsad, he would like to hear why CAGAS endorsed the report.

Dr. Filipink told senators that after two sessions of discussion, CAGAS found, by an 8-2 vote, that the arguments made by Provost's office representatives were convincing. He said CAGAS was convinced by their arguments that the elimination of UNIV 100 as a graduation requirement and the refocusing of the FYE program on Y courses and faculty would produce both an improved outcome and actual data to assess whether there was an improved outcome. He added that rather than, as has happened throughout this process with any group that has proposed changes, denying that there is any way to assess this, the current proposal is committed to assessing whether these revisions are going to work and has said that they will change them if they do not. Dr. Filipink related that CAGAS endorsed the proposal with the idea that it would come back to Faculty Senate in a couple of years with data to show whether it was actually producing the outcomes that were sought. Chairperson Pynes stated that this is why ExCo sent the proposal to CAGAS: to answer questions such as those posed by the FYE Leadership Team and related by Dr. Robinett. He pointed out that CAGAS considered the proposal over four hours of discussion and told senators that if

they want the CAGAS minutes he will obtain them. Dr. Filipink pointed out that CAGAS requested a report each summer of the assessment results so that those can be included in the CAGAS annual report that goes to Faculty Senate at the beginning of each fall semester.

Senator Allison said she finds the argument from CAGAS compelling as well as the argument from Dr. Baker-Sperry that this topic could be discussed for decades. Senator Allison admitted she has found UNIV 100 as a graduation requirement to be problematic for years and would like to see the University move away from that. She thinks everyone knows the arguments against UNIV 100 but admitted that she has never taught it because she does not want to teach a class with set guidelines for instruction; that is not how she teaches, and although she may be able to hit the goals for UNIV 100, she would not be able to teach it the way she was told in the past it had to be taught. Senator Allison thinks UNIV 100 needs to be an academic course taught by academics, the same as Y courses.

Senator Bellott observed that Dr. Baker-Sperry referred to UNIV 100 moving forward as a “control group,” but if advisors are only suggesting that OAS students take the course, that would result in a very flawed control group because only a subset of the population would take the class and it would only be optional. Interim Associate Provost Mossman asked why this would be flawed because there would be a way to measure students who actually take the course against students who do not. Senator Bellott pointed out that data shows that non-OAS students retain higher than OAS students. Senator Cordes suggested that some OAS students would opt not to take the course, so they could be compared to OAS students who took the course. Senator Bellott suspects that would be a very small data set. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad remarked that this would be similar to trying to extrapolate data across the campus based on results from living-learning communities populated by honors students. Chairperson Pynes asked how large the control group and the non-control group will be. Interim Associate Provost Mossman anticipates moving from 30-40 sections of UNIV 100 currently to six to ten sections after the change, depending upon enrollment and class size. Chairperson Pynes asked if this would be approximately 150 students; Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that is probably correct. Chairperson Pynes asked if there will be 150 OAS students not taking UNIV 100. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied that there will not; the number will probably be much smaller than that. Chairperson Pynes observed that this is the source of the complaint against using UNIV 100 as a control group.

Dr. Baker-Sperry admitted that this will not be perfect because it is a real live situation. She has done a lot of research on the issue of self-selection, and currently with UNIV 100 being required for the general population there is no basis for comparison at all. She stated that in a perfect world it would be ideal to create a very tightly controlled experimental group where students would be randomly assigned, but that is not the type of real, lived experience that will occur at WIU; the University cannot afford that financially, and that is not where it is in the process. Dr. Baker-Sperry told senators that there is an argument for comparing and measuring students with like variables, and there are students at WIU that share certain variables with OAS students that can be compared. She also hopes that there will be very academically strong students who may also choose to take UNIV 100, and comparisons can occur across those groups. She stressed, though, that the Provost’s office does not want to give the impression that there would be a perfect model. Interim Associate Provost Mossman stressed the point is that the Provost’s office is committed to actually doing this kind of work and believes that this assessment needs to be done. He believes it needs to be determined and measured whether the FYE program is effective in order to address the questions that are being raised. He stated that while the conversation could continue about producing data, there is confusion even about what the FYE program is intending to do every year. Interim Associate Provost Mossman believes that this proposal is a way to address this and to provide

Faculty Senate with an annual report on FYE's effectiveness while centering resources on faculty expertise because the University does not have \$800,000 to put into the FYE program any more.

Senator Bellott said he is not against eliminating UNIV 100, adding that it seems like a lot of people want that to happen. He is confused, however, about why there is an effort to cram more into Y courses. He stated that if he wanted to create a Y course, there would not be room to do what is being suggested in the proposal because the course content would not allow sufficient time. Interim Associate Provost Mossman replied the goal is to create a learning environment for first semester students with a peer mentor to help build that environment, including developing an identification with the institution, which helps retention.

Senator Dimitrov suggested that Faculty Senate discuss making the entire FYE program optional. Interim Associate Provost Mossman pointed out that this is not part of the Provost's office proposal. Chairperson Pynes expressed his support for the proposal even though he thinks it should be stronger. He believes the proposal is intermediary and does not think the Provost's office is ready for the FYE program to become entirely voluntary. Chairperson Pynes stressed that at this point he thinks senators should maintain the discussion about the proposal that is in front of them because they will have to vote on it. He said nobody is asking that the Provost's office create a perfect study for FYE, but to create a study that is flawed from the start seems a fool's errand. He observed that it is known that the top three reasons why students are not retained at WIU are finances, family problems, and being unprepared, and he is not sure how FYE solves those top three problems. He would like to see the Provost's office talk to someone to help them develop a group that can be assessed because he would not like to see the data flawed because of some other aspect that goes along with those students who are admitted under the OAS program.

Parliamentarian Lauer served on Faculty Senate when the FYE program was initially passed, and at that time former Vice President for Student Services Gary Biller presented assessment data that supposedly demonstrated that the peer mentor model, using a Noel-Levitz survey instrument, did increase retention, although Parliamentarian Lauer thought that the data was "messed up." Senator Macchi remarked that former Vice President Biller was talking about the Building Connections program, which originated as a result of Noel-Levitz recommendations and became part of UNIV 100. She stated that the data shows that students that go to both of their Building Connections meetings are more successful in retention. She added that this information was included as part of the Faculty Senate ad hoc FYE Review Committee's report. Senator Bellott pointed out that it is possible that students that go to both Building Connections meetings might have been retained at a higher level anyway. Chairperson Pynes agreed, pointing out that the WIU administration often says that if students will only come to campus, they can be encouraged to enroll, but it might also be true that students who are already inclined to enroll at WIU are the ones that visit the campus. Senator Cordes remarked that most measures are inferred.

Senator Boynton asked if it is possible to get the data on freshmen/sophomore retention for the ten years before the University began the FYE program compared to the most recent ten years. She knows there are a lot of other factors that go into why students are retained but thinks it would be interesting to see if there is a significant increase in retention overall. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that WIU has just undergone 12 years of down enrollment and is about to have its six-year graduation rate fall below 50 percent, so he is not sure what this data would show. Associate Provost Russ Morgan stated that in 2013-14, he and Psychology professor David Lane conducted a big assessment analysis of FYE, and that was the last time the program was changed. He related the analysis looked at the five years prior to WIU adopting FYE and compared it to the five years after its adoption. He admits the analysis is not perfect since student profiles and other variables change, but through regression

analysis and looking at models they determined at that time that there was little to no relationship between FYE and retention. Associate Provost Morgan stated that the data showed only a weak relationship, and if anything there was a negative trend. He pointed out, however, that something like what Senator Boynton is suggesting has been done previously, which led to the most recent changes that have been implemented over the last five or six years.

Chairperson Pynes pointed out that since the agenda item is a report from CAGAS, either no one objects to the report and it will be automatically approved, or someone will need to object to the report, at which time senators can vote to return it to the agenda for further discussion and a vote.

Senator Maskarinec stated that, regarding Senator Macchi's concerns, he agrees that "This proposal is nearly identical to the FYE Y classes we had prior to 2011" because he was on Faculty Senate at that time, and it can now be seen that they were pretty much a failure. He stated that if FYE plans to go back to the way it was formerly, that is not moving forward. He related that by whatever measures they had at that time, there were a lot of discussions at Faculty Senate before those changes were made, and they were a failure, so he would like to hear a response to this concern that was brought up by Senator Macchi. Interim Associate Provost Mossman acknowledged that the proposal is close and near identical, but asserted that in practice it will be different in the way the Provost's office functions in relation to FYE. He stressed his commitment to meeting with chairs and faculty and to paying attention to how the FYE program is functioning – not just as maintenance, such as checking enrollment, but to whether it can develop a spirit of community and an investment by students in the program. He believes that if this is in place, the FYE program will work, and if it is proven not to work once assessment can be developed, then at least that will be known. He remarked that the FYE program seems to bring out endless discussions, such as that occurring at the current meeting, and he thinks the University needs to move forward on it.

Dr. Filipink, in response to Senator Maskarinec's question regarding what will change in Y classes from the model prior to 2011, pointed out that, on the most basic level, the FYE requirement has gone from two Y courses, to one Y course plus UNIV 100, and is now proposed to only require one Y course. He recalled the argument in the past was that the second Y course created more of a burden and did not improve retention or provide the positive outcomes that the original program was supposed to provide. He recalled that the argument was that replacing the second Y course with UNIV 100 would improve retention as well as improving students' ability to adapt to the University. He observed that now the University may move to a single Y course and hope that this model will work.

Senator Macchi agrees with Senator Maskarinec that the structure of the course is nearly identical, and it did not work the first time. She appreciates the desire to foster the culture of FYE because she thinks that is very important, but she wonders what happens if individuals rotate out of the Provost's office. She wonders what will happen if Interim Associate Provost Mossman is not in that office if the program relies on him creating this culture and if the class structure is nearly identical. She also observed that culture can be difficult to create because one cannot control who is put into those FYE classes, and someone may be assigned to teach the class who does not want to teach it. She is concerned because the structure of the Y classes is nearly identical to what the FYE program had before, and it did not work. Dr. Baker-Sperry asked what causes Senator Macchi to say that it failed. Senator Macchi replied that she bases her statement on two years of review. She related that one of the major things that came out of that review, which occurred when she was a member of the review committee, not the FYE Faculty Associate, were that peer mentors were not being used consistently by the faculty who taught those courses, according to focus groups held with the peer mentors. Dr. Baker-Sperry asked why Y courses should be

considered a failure if peer mentors were not used the same way across those courses. Senator Macchi responded that the review looked at and dissected every FYE component and goal at that time; they found, for example, that the common readings were not used in all disciplines. Dr. Baker-Sperry pointed out that this is one way that the current proposal differs from what went before. Senator Macchi stated that this is just one example, but the review found that the goals of FYE were not being met in the Y courses prior to that time.

Chairperson Pynes asked if any senator has an objection to the recommendation from CAGAS. Senator Boynton responded she would like to object because she thinks this is an important enough decision that there should be a vote on it rather than it sliding through. She also would like clarification on the peer mentor choice issue.

SENATOR BOYNTON OBJECTED TO THE REPORT

Motion: To return the report to the agenda (Allison/Perabo)

MOTION APPROVED 10 YES – 5 NO – 0 AB

Senator Perabo thinks the important thing to accomplish now is the elimination of the UNIV 100 graduation requirement, which she would definitely like to support. She thinks the position of peer mentors is crucial and that they are being asked to do a lot and should be paid for it. She observed that Senator Macchi's document expressing concerns about the proposal mentioned that peer mentors would have greater responsibilities without getting paid more. Senator Perabo asked if they will still receive \$250 per semester; Interim Associate Provost Mossman confirmed this is correct. He does not think peer mentors will be asked to do additional work than what they are already responsible for in UNIV 100. He reiterated that the list of things peer mentors might be asked to do is more of a menu than an actual list of requirements. He concurs with the recommendation of CAGAS that there needs to be close attention paid to peer mentors; they are not teaching assistants, so they should not be overworked, nor should they be ignored since the idea is to build relationships in those classes. He asserted that most peer mentors are not in the position to get rich. Senator Perabo pointed out that it is a job for these students. Interim Associate Provost Mossman agrees that it is a job but thinks there are other motivations for these students, asserting that they want to develop those relationships and pointing out that most of these students will also get letters of recommendation from this work.

Senator Dimitrov recalled that the way FYE was presented by former President Al Goldfarb was as a communal program for the students, and peer mentors were supposed to be volunteers. He thinks the spirit of the original proposal was completely false. Chairperson Pynes thinks the peer mentors have always been paid and that this amount has not changed for the 15 years of FYE.

Mr. Markey related that Dr. Baker-Sperry and Interim Associate Provost Mossman brought the proposal to SGA. SGA voted to support the proposal but asked a question about pay for peer mentors. Mr. Markey related that SGA was told the type of student that would apply to be a peer mentor is not doing it for the pay but for other reasons. Mr. Markey does not necessarily think that peer mentors need more compensation; while it would be a benefit, it may not be necessary. Some of the peer mentors that Mr. Markey talked to would like to have more responsibilities and more work, more "skin in the game." Mr. Markey thinks that faculty picking peer mentors allows for bias. He had understood that all of the curriculum that peer mentors would instruct would be communalized; all peer mentors would teach the same material and it would not be based on the class that is being taught. He does not think students should have to take a certain class in order to be considered as a peer mentor for that class. Chairperson Pynes agrees that the new model should have no content-specific

knowledge that peer mentors should have to have, which is one of the reasons the Provost's office wanted to centralize this process.

Chairperson Pynes pointed out that the time had reached 5:45 and there are other people with business on the agenda. He noted that Faculty Senate can have another meeting and may have to have one in June anyway. Senators asked if they could call the question. Chairperson Pynes observed that no motion has been made so there is no question to call.

Senator Cordes thinks that peer mentor expertise can be addressed, but payment should be by block grant. He related that every place he has worked with students or worked as a student limited the number of hours that they could work per week. He suggests that the Provost's office determine how much the workload is and how much peer mentors work for each different class and department to try to get a barometer of how much time it is taking based on what it is acceptable for them to do.

Motion: To approve the report from CAGAS (Rahman/Allison)

Friendly amendment: That the vote be by secret ballot (Bellott). The friendly amendment was accepted.

MOTION APPROVED BY SECRET BALLOT 9 YES – 7 NO – 0 AB

Chairperson Pynes remarked that there will be a Board of Trustees meeting in the near future, and Faculty Senate will be asked to consent to items on their agenda. He observed that historically the things Faculty Senate is asked to consent to are things the Chair does not feel conflicted about, but a situation may occur similar to 2015-16 when the BOT eliminated four academic programs with only 13 days' notice. Chairperson Pynes stated that if the BOT has on its agenda the elimination of any academic program, Faculty Senate will meet to discuss whether it wants to approve or not approve that action item. He reminded senators that they serve until the beginning of Fall 2019 semester, and the meeting will have zoom capabilities. Senator Boynton asked if Chairperson Pynes expects the meeting to be in May or in June because she retires on May 31. Chairperson Pynes replied he thinks she would still be a senator because most of the senators will also be off contract by that time, but the Executive Committee can interpret that if needed.

Motion: To move Old Business to the end of the agenda (Bellott/Boynton)

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE

V. New Business

A. Proposal to Merge the Department of Accounting and Finance with the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences to Create a New School

Senator Boynton asked if there is a breakdown by department so that senators can know how each department voted. Jack Elfrink, Interim Dean of the College of Business and Technology, responded that the vote was favorable for the Department of Accounting and Finance and unfavorable from faculty in the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences. Tara Feld, Interim Chair of the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences, related that as she talked to faculty in her department, she did not ask them to disclose their votes to her but to come to her if they had any concerns. She related that several faculty told her they voted "no" in protest to being asked to vote for something they felt had been dictated all along. She has not, however, heard a lot of angst or hostility toward the merger in her department, and she thinks faculty realize the budgetary realities behind the proposal. Dr. Feld related that both departments are rather tiny compared to others in the College and will be about the same size as Computer Sciences and Management/Marketing once combined, so she has not felt a huge amount of anxiety on the part of her faculty. She thinks, rather, the vote was more about the process than the outcome. Chairperson Pynes asked Dr. Feld to tell her faculty that Faculty

Senate worked very hard to get them that input and that the Senate appreciates their vote, even if it was in protest.

Motion: To extend the meeting time to 6:30 p.m. (Bellott/Boynton)

MOTION APPROVED 14 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB

Senator Allison remarked that “no” is a symbolic protest vote that she takes very seriously, and she is concerned about it. She added that it makes her very concerned about this report and asked if everyone in that department voted “no.” Dr. Feld responded that there were also a lot of faculty who failed to vote. Senator Allison asked how many faculty did not vote. Senator Boynton pointed out that the documentation lists 26 total faculty; 19 voted, including only one abstention. Chairperson Pynes asked if the College conducted a second vote; Interim Dean Elfrink responded that they did not.

Chairperson Pynes pointed out that a concern for senators is that a majority of faculty in the departments must agree to the creation of a school, and only 11 of the 26 voted to approve it. He asked how many tenure track faculty there are; Dr. Feld responded that there are 20 Unit A. Gregg Woodruff, Chair of the Department of Accounting and Finance, stated that some of the “yes” votes were from Unit A faculty. Interim Dean Elfrink explained that faculty from both departments submitted their votes electronically to the office specialist in the Department of Accounting and Finance; she separated those votes out to determine that there were 7 “yes” votes and 6 “no” votes from Unit A faculty. He added that many did not vote. Chairperson Pynes observed that in this case logically an abstention would count as a “no” vote since 7 out of 20 is not a majority. He added that while he is not opposed to the merger, the issue is also about the creation of a school in general using the Provost’s office official University policy. He thought in the email he sent to Interim Dean Elfrink it specified that the proposal must be approved by a majority of tenure or tenure-track faculty.

Senator Allison does not care if the two departments merge, but she does care about the process since she works in a department that will also be doing this, and this process does not seem to be going the way people keep assuring her that it would go. She sees red flags all over the place. When Senator Allison asked Interim Provost Clow what would happen if there was a “no” vote,” he said those involved would have to keep talking until people were convinced to move from “no” to “yes.” Chairperson Pynes observed that President Thomas continued the Academic Realignment Task Force into next year, so he thinks the President has given up on the idea that all the changes have to be completed this year.

Dr. Woodruff observed that one of the reasons that some people did not vote is because they will leave the University in May. He told senators that three Unit A faculty in Accounting/Finance are retiring in May, so they said it is not their game anymore. He believes the fact that they did not vote should not count as an abstention. Dr. Woodruff related that one faculty who voted “no” told him the process is ridiculous and to vote would be a waste of his time because at this point the fiscal reality trumps the process. Chairperson Pynes stated that he respectfully disagrees with the faculty member. He pointed out that the Executive Committee fought hard to make sure that faculty were part of this process. He added that Faculty Senate did not use its own process but is using the Provost’s process.

Chairperson Pynes asked how many Unit A faculty will be in the department in the fall. Dr. Woodruff replied there will be 12 Unit A and B faculty in the Department of Accounting and Finance this fall. Chairperson Pynes observed that, according to the form submitted by the College, it appears there will be 14 tenure or tenure track faculty in the fall between the two departments. He pointed out that the guidelines specify that only tenured or tenure-track faculty should vote, and the proposal must be approved by a majority of those faculty in the departments. He stated that if there are 11 Unit A in Accounting/Finance and 9 Unit A in Economics/Decision Sciences currently, and if each department is losing three, that would leave 14 Unit A in the fall. Dr. Feld stated that she will not lose any Unit A faculty in the fall so will still have 9. Chairperson Pynes stated that in that case there will be 17, and 11 “yes”

votes out of the 17, but senators pointed out that there is no way of knowing whether all of the 11 “yes” votes were Unit A; they might even include retirees.

Senator Dimitrov asked what the role of the Provost’s office is in regards to the vote. He recalled that the Department of Mathematics never voted on the merger with Philosophy and wonders if they to redo that vote. Parliamentarian Lauer pointed out that there was no creation of a school in that case. Chairperson Pynes added that in this case it is both the merger of two departments and creation of a school.

Interim Dean Elfrink related that faculty were asked to vote on two questions: one was about the reorganization to establish a school and the other was on the name of the proposed school. Chairperson Pynes stated that because the Provost’s office has agreed on this process, Faculty Senate is using the same process for both creation of a school and justification for a merger. Interim Dean Elfrink stated that was unclear.

Dr. Woodruff pointed out that in the University Professionals of Illinois (UPI) contract it indicates that the Unit A faculty in a department can choose to extend voting rights to Unit B faculty. He stated that in both of the programs in his department, the tenured and tenure-track faculty voted to extend voting rights to the Unit B faculty. He asked if the policy being used in this case can dominate the contract. Chairperson Pynes responded that the contract also says that faculty affected by mergers get to vote; it does not say anything about having to have a majority but rather says that faculty are supposed to have input. He said this raises the question of what constitutes input. Chairperson Pynes observed that when there is a weak process and a decision needs to be made about what constitutes a successful process during a conflicted time, it becomes difficult, but one way to handle that is to go to a policy that has already been agreed upon when times were less difficult. He pointed out that the Provost’s office had agreed on the policy for creation of schools, which requires a majority vote, and a vote is a kind of input; the policy was agreed on by the Provost’s office, the faculty, and the Union. He said the Senate Executive Committee understood that they could use this policy that was agreed to when times were not difficult for purposes of the current process, but he does not know if this policy supersedes a contract that is vague. He noted that the contract only says “input,” so if 100 percent of the faculty voted “no” and that was their input, the administration could still say that they were doing the merger anyway, and he does not think that is what is desired. He believes that using a process and a policy that was created by the Provost’s office in good times for something similar and which everyone agreed to is a fair way for both sides to handle this. Dr. Woodruff pointed out that UPI just agreed on an entirely new contract and the language is still there which gives Unit A faculty the right to extend voting rights to Unit B faculty, and the faculty in his department wanted to do that. Interim Dean Elfrink added that the votes took place before the clarification regarding Unit A faculty.

Senator Perabo stated she is not concerned about the logistics of Unit A and B issues but with the fact that the majority of Economics and Decision Sciences faculty, including Unit B, voted against the proposal. Her position is that if one department does not support the proposal, then it should not be done, regardless of other considerations. Chairperson Pynes asked if Senator Perabo wanted to make that a motion. Senator Perabo declined but said that is her argument. Senator Boynton shares Senator Perabo’s concern. She compared the proposed merger to a forced marriage and does not think it is a good precedent to set.

Senator Bellott asked if Faculty Senate can vote against the proposed creation of a school but the department could still merge. Chairperson Pynes responded that this process has been incredibly complex. He stated that ideally the goal was to have the merger and the school creation be one vote. He is hesitant to force one department, which did not vote because they did not like the process, into a merger without further discussion. He recalled that Interim Provost Clow said last Tuesday, April 23, that if people do not get on board [with reorganization proposals], then discussions would have to continue, not that things would have to be forced. Chairperson Pynes said that faculty have already seen what top-down forcing looks like. He believes that if senators vote “no” on the creation of this school, it is also a “no” vote on the proposed merger, and the departments would be asked to continue their

discussions to make sure everybody is on the same page. He added that whether the Faculty Senate's recommendation vote is decisive is a different question.

Motion: To approve the school merger as proposed (Bellott/Rahman)

MOTION FAILED 1 YES – 10 NO – 1 AB

Dr. Feld stated that if the chairs go back to their departments and try to talk things out with their faculty, then revote on the proposal, she is concerned with the timing. She observed that faculty will leave in the next two weeks, and her department does not have an office manager or department chair after July 1. She wonders how the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences will run in the interim until this can be worked out. Chairperson Pynes responded that Faculty Senate is 100 percent likely to have a meeting in June. He remarked that there are lots of departments without chairs and secretaries, adding that the former Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies existed for a year and a half without a secretary. Chairperson Pynes stated that, while he is sympathetic, these are the consequences of administrative decisions that were not completely thought out. He stated that while Faculty Senate is trying to make sure that the departments get what they want, it is also obsessed with faculty input because that was formerly usurped from faculty and the Senate is working to take it back. He added that the Senate's vote is not about not wanting the two departments to merge. Senator Allison said she seconds this sentiment, stressing that it is not about the merger of the two departments, but if it goes through as is there is no process

Senator Dimitrov thinks Faculty Senate needs to clarify the role of the body in this process before these types of items are put on the agenda in future. He thinks senators need to know the exact rules for voting and the consequences before putting these items on the Senate agenda and voting for or against,. Chairperson Pynes said he would second that, and believes that if there had been an Executive Committee meeting in between the two Senate meetings there could have been more clarity, but the administration decided to halt all reorganization discussions until after the APER Committee report, which then compressed everything. He acknowledged that part of the problem is not the fault of the College and explained that Faculty Senate is just trying to hold the line until everyone can have the appropriate input.

Senator Boynton asked Chairperson Pynes to confirm that everything no longer has to be done by June 1. Chairperson Pynes confirmed this is correct since President Thomas extended the Academic Reorganization Task Force to continue into next year. He does not believe the urgency still exists to have all of these changes done by the summer, which is what was articulated when the reorganization was first announced in June of last year. He thinks the administration would like for as much reorganization as possible to be completed, which is why Interim Provost Clow said the plans to not have to all come forward at once.

B. Proposal to Merge the Department of Engineering Technology with the School of Engineering

Interim Dean Elfrink explained that the vote for these two units occurred before the clarification regarding Unit A; they used Survey Monkey to vote, so the College was unable to separate out who was voting since there were no email addresses attached to the votes. Chairperson Pynes observed that the responses do not seem as bimodal. Interim Dean Elfrink remarked that the vote was somewhat negative from faculty in the School of Engineering and very positive from faculty in the Department of Engineering Technology. Agriculture professor Mark Bernards, who chairs the College of Business and Technology Faculty Council, observed that after the Council met they learned that five of the votes were from faculty assistants, who are neither Unit A nor Unit B but function much like adjuncts. Interim Dean Elfrink explained that these individuals are typically allowed to participate in voting when there are issues at the departmental level.

Senator Zbeeb stated that when faculty in the School of Engineering voted there were no guidelines, so a lot of non-faculty voted, but even with these votes it was really negative regarding combining the two units. He believes most of the 18 faculty in Engineering do not

want the merger. He is not sure if everyone in Engineering Technology voted or if that vote also included non-faculty. Rafael Obregon, Interim Chair of the Department of Engineering Technology, responded that all their votes were from Unit A faculty, none from Unit B.

Senator Zbeeb had understood that the two units need to be on the same page, but he does not think that they are. He pointed out that this proposal is different than the previous one because one unit is a school located in the Quad Cities (Engineering) and the other a department located in Macomb (Engineering Technology); they are not located in the same building or on the same floor where they can share resources. Senator Zbeeb pointed out that Engineering just started a new program and wants the full focus of their Director to be there because they want the new program to grow. He does not think that the merger will be productive. He also does not think the money saved as shown on the proposal is entirely accurate because there are some hidden costs; the intent is to save a chair's salary, but there are the costs of having the Director travel back and forth from the Quad Cities campus to Macomb and losing work hours driving rather than focusing on one unit or the other. He thinks these hidden costs will affect the programs and encouraged senators to vote against the proposal because it is not in the best interests of WIU.

Senator Boynton asked if the proposed new unit would be called the School of Engineering and Engineering Technology; Interim Dean Elfrink responded that this is still unclear. He added that this proposal is different than the previous one because a school already exists, so he needs to have clarity on that as well. Senator Dimitrov asked if it is correct that if a school is being created there needs to be a vote, but if the Department of History is merging with the Department of Political Science there does not need to be a vote. Interim Dean Elfrink pointed out that in the case of Engineering and Engineering Technology there is one of each [one school and one department]. Chairperson Pynes clarified this proposal is for creation of a school because two units are being merged to create a new school. Senator Dimitrov asked if this means that there is no vote needed for mergers of departments. Chairperson Pynes responded that the process is parallel because that is the way that Faculty Senate gets input from both departments.

Motion: To reject the proposal (Zbeeb/Rahman)

MOTION APPROVED 10 YES – 1 NO – 2 AB

Dr. Filipink asked, as Chair of the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Council, whether they were expected to provide Faculty Senate with the vote totals by department for proposed mergers in that college. Chairperson Pynes responded this is correct but only the totals from Unit A faculty are needed. Interim Dean Elfrink asked if Faculty Senate has any guidance going forward. Chairperson Pynes responded that there needs to be a meeting with the Interim Provost.

C. Resolution in Support of WIU's Teacher Education Programs

**WIU FACULTY SENATE'S RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF
WIU'S TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

Whereas Western Illinois University (WIU) was originally established as a Teacher Education ("Normal") School and has been preparing students to be K-12 teachers for well over a century;

Whereas WIU has designated Teacher Education across the disciplines as a "Signature Program," consistent with the university's mission and with its founding purpose as a teacher's college.

Whereas the Faculty Senate is WIU's shared governance body charged with faculty oversight of all academic matters at WIU;

Whereas graduates of WIU teacher education programs who are teaching in Illinois schools have always been one of the most effective means this university has for recruiting prospective students;

Whereas there is a high demand for and a statewide shortage of qualified teachers in the state of Illinois, including in WIU's service region;

Whereas the preparation of future teachers is shared across all four academic colleges (CAS: English, French, Spanish, Math, Science (Biology, Chemistry, & Physics), Social Science (History), and School Psychology; COBT: Agriculture; COFAC: Music, Art, and Speech and Language Impaired; and COEHS: Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle Level, Special Education, Physical Education, Bilingual/ESL Education, Reading Specialist, Technology Specialist, School Counseling, School Principal, and Superintendent);

Whereas the state of Illinois is in the midst of eliminating some of the state-mandated and expensive barriers to students' successful completion of all teacher education programs in the state, including those in Art Education, Spanish Education, French Education, and Bilingual/ESL Education, which will lead to an increase in graduates in all teacher education programs;

Whereas the Spanish Teacher Education and French Teacher Education programs have already been approved as options within the Foreign Languages major (rather than as separate majors);

Whereas the Spanish Education and French Education programs require only one course (generally offered as an independent study) in addition to the courses that must be offered to meet the needs of other majors in the Foreign Languages and Literatures Department;

Whereas the state of Illinois, including WIU's service region, will continue to experience an increase in the number and percentage of people in the traditional college-age population who are bilingual, many of whom enroll in WIU's Spanish Education or Bilingual/ESL Education programs;

Whereas the Bilingual/ESL Teacher Education program supports students seeking endorsements not only in Bilingual Education, but also in the Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) minor, the TESOL postbaccalaureate certificate, and the Language, Culture and Education track of the M.S.Ed. degree in Educational Studies, and Bilingual Education courses also serve the BGS degree and the Anthropology major;

Whereas the Illinois State Board of Education's new Superintendent of Education, Dr. Carmen Ayala, is a strong supporter of Bilingual Education and is well aware that the shortage of Bilingual teachers in Illinois is acute and is surpassed only by that in one other field;

Whereas the Art Education program (now a BFA degree) is one of the principle reasons Art students choose WIU's Department of Art, regardless of which option they initially pursue within the Art major, since many parents will not consider allowing their children to study in an Art Department lacking a teacher education option.

Whereas WIU's Art Education students work with K-12 students in area schools, providing their knowledge and time to enrich those students' educational experiences, thus acting as recruitment ambassadors for WIU for students interested in many different majors;

Whereas the Art Department's Teacher Education program has been successful in placing all of its graduates in teaching positions within one year of graduation, indicating both the demand within the field and the esteem in which WIU's Art Education program is held;

Therefore, be it resolved, the WIU Faculty Senate, the shared governance body charged with faculty oversight of all academic matters at WIU, urges the WIU Board of Trustees (BOT) to

rescind the WIU administration's plans to eliminate teacher education programs in Art, Bilingual/ESL, French, and Spanish, and asks the BOT to support the continuation of WIU's university-wide commitment to teacher education as part of the university's strong and continuing mission to provide the highest quality teachers for the state's K-12 schools.

Motion: To approve the resolution (Perabo/Allison)

Senator Rahman pointed out Document F [from the document obtained by the FOIA] expressed a desire to evaluate Biology, Chemistry, and Physics Teacher Education, so when senators vote for this resolution it has a larger impact than just Foreign Languages, Bilingual Education, and Art. She observed Document F also shows the administration wants to inactivate the History major, which has a direct impact on the Social Sciences. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that, to be fair, the information in that document was from the last realignment plan, not the current one.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE

Senator Boynton asked, since this is a motion from the Faculty Senate to the BOT, whether Chairperson Pynes will submit it to them. Chairperson Pynes responded that he will send it to the Trustees and put it in his report to the BOT.

D. For the Good of the Body – None

IV. Old Business (*Reordered*)

A. Extension SCH from Institutional Research and Planning

Chairperson Pynes suggested that this report be tabled until the next regularly scheduled meeting.

NO OBJECTIONS

Motion: To adjourn (Rahman)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Susan Czechowski, Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary