

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Special Meeting, 21 May 2019, 3:00 p.m.

Horrabin Hall 1/WIUQC Riverfront 205

ACTION MINUTES

SENATORS PRESENT: M. Allison, E. Asare, B. Bellott, V. Boynton, S. Cordes, G. Delany-Barmann, M. Maskarinec, H. McIlvaine-Newsad, J. Plos, C. Pynes, S. Rahman, C. Tarrant, F. Tasdan

Ex-officio: Billy Clow, Interim Provost; Ilon Lauer, Parliamentarian

SENATORS ABSENT: S. Czechowski, R. Dimitrov, J. Franken, A. Hyde, S. Macchi, B. Perabo, K. Zbeeb

GUESTS: Lori Baker-Sperry, Keith Boeckelman, Amy Carr, Brian Davies, Katrina Daytner, Dennis DeVolder, Jack Elfrink, Tara Feld, Rich Filipink, Laura Frey, Buzz Hoon, Kishor Kapale, Sharon Keeling, Angela Lynn, Colton Markey, Sue Martinelli-Fernandez, Rose McConnell, Kristi Mindrup (via teleconference), Greg Montalvo, Russ Morgan, Mark Mossman, Jill Myers, Kat Myers, Lorette Oden, Luciano Picanço, Renee Polubinsky, Jeremy Robinett, Roger Runquist, Eric Sheffield, Melissa Telles, Bill Thompson, Gregg Woodruff

I. Announcements

A. Approvals from the President and Provost

1. Approvals from the President

a. Elimination of UNIV 100 graduation requirement

2. Approvals from the Provost

a. Requests for New Courses

i. COMM 333, Risk & Crisis Communication, 3 s.h.

ii. GIS 302, GIS Software and Scripting, 3 s.h.

b. Request for Change of Option

i. Applied Music

c. Request for Change of Major

i. Business Analytics

d. Request for New Minor

i. Applied Mathematics

B. Provost's Report

Interim Provost Clow told senators he has been working on some projects from the beginning of the year and trying to close up loose ends to prepare for the transition when the new Provost takes office. He stated that not all of the details have been worked out yet for the issue regarding Library books that was discussed at the Executive Committee meeting. Senator Allison remarked she did not know until recently that with the contract reduction the University would not have a reference librarian this summer. She will be on sabbatical in Fall 2019 and wanted to ramp up her research this summer but will now not have anybody on staff to help guide her, which she said sets off alarm bells. She finds even more alarming the connection to iSHARE and read to senators an email sent to her from a faculty librarian: "Should we fail to migrate to the new iSHARE platform, we will almost certainly be forced to withdraw from the iSHARE interlibrary resource sharing system, i.e., be kicked out. Since our holdings will no longer reside in the iSHARE catalog, our

patrons will be cut off from iSHARE resources at UIUC, UIC, and the rest of the state's 90+ academic institutions. Furthermore, we will no longer be a functioning circulation system, cataloguing system, reserve system, acquisitions system, nor even a basic online catalog to display our current books and availability status." Senator Allison said this is because apparently WIU's card catalog resides at the University of Illinois. She continued reading: "WIU Library services and our patrons will be dead in the water. WIU will probably be forced to purchase a new, always extraordinarily expensive integrated library management system by ourselves, foregoing the massive cost benefits associated with a consortium we bargained and purchased, such as iSHARE. Worse, we will be cut off from iSHARE libraries and the benefits of free statewide library resource sharing." Senator Allison is not sure how many people on campus are aware that University Libraries is undergoing this crisis moment and that if they do not have people on campus this summer that can do this migration, WIU will not have iSHARE.

Interim Provost Clow had thought there was a plan to address this. Senator Cordes explained that, theoretically, two full contract people will be on staff this summer; those two can handle the website and implementation of the Library catalog. He told senators that University Libraries has deferred adopting a new system for a long time, but the consortium now says that this cannot be deferred any longer. He explained that if University Libraries does not have a full-time faculty library specialist to work on this, the two people who are on contract this summer will implement that new card catalog and access to iSHARE, so those services should be moving forward if there are contracts with these two individuals. Senator Cordes stated that what will be lost, however, is there will be no reference desk, no email or phone reference help, no support for video development, no tours for graduate or new student orientation. Senator Cordes will be available to help with Student Orientation and Registration (SOAR) this summer since it occurs before July 1, but probably not in future. He told senators there will be no government document librarians, no patent contacts for businesses, no maps or GIS support. He said database access and iSHARE will be available, but there will be no support, just the technical implementation. He is sure University Libraries will try to have other people trained to be available to support these things but said these are what should be available if full-time contracts are written for the two individuals. Librarian and University Professionals of Illinois (UPI) President Bill Thompson added that there are currently no contracts written for these two individuals, so the problem has not been solved. He stated that as of now faculty in the Library are on nine-month contracts, and no one has a summer contract. Interim Provost Clow said his office finished writing the 12-month contracts today. Dr. Thompson replied that he had not been informed of that; Interim Provost Clow said he was just informed.

In response to Parliamentarian Lauer's question during the Executive Committee meeting about the availability of summer proctoring, Senator Cordes said that classrooms can be reserved through the summer but not with the formal process they have now. Dr. Thompson added that it is unknown what the 12-month contracts look like and whether they are supplemental or true 12-month contracts. Chairperson Pynes stated that contract implementation is a separate issue from whether the services are available, but Dr. Thompson replied that actually it is not because the consortium have said they will not accept three-month contracts. Senator Allison reported the system specialist who spoke to her about this also said that a supplemental contract will not be acceptable, and if there is no one to do the work then the University will lose iSHARE. She also wonders, if 12-month contracts are to be written, whether this will solve the problem at WIUQC where there is only one librarian so if he has to be sick or is on vacation their library is closed. Interim Provost Clow responded that there is a committee working to address this problem.

Senator Allison observed that in looking at the WIU reserves, it seems the University is still in a state of crisis, and the state of Illinois is also sort of still in a state of crisis, but reserves in 2018 were \$5,567,400, which is more than the reserves were in 2001. She stated that in 2001 the reserves stood at \$5,183,200 and then started to go down. She added that reserves were back to over \$5 million in 2007 and climbed to a high of \$23,807,500 in 2015. Senator Allison thinks that if the University reserves are at the same level they were in 2001, it seems to be less of a crisis, so she does not understand some of the decisions being made. Interim Provost Clow responded that he does not know the reserve status, and it appears that no one from Budget attended the meeting. Chairperson Pynes related that historically the reason the University wants some reserves is that the state does not pay as quickly as they used to; instead of giving money to universities at the

beginning of the year, they give it out piecemeal. Dr. Thompson stated that State Comptroller Susana Mendoza has delivered during the fiscal year every year since she was elected. Interim Associate Provost Mossman remarked that payroll for the University is approximately \$10 million per month, so \$5 million would not meet payroll should the state be late one month. Chairperson Pynes corrected that payroll is now closer to \$9 million per month.

Senator Boynton has been reading about a proposal in the state legislature to eliminate the algebra requirement in public schools. She wonders what this would mean for WIU's Department of Mathematics and Philosophy. Parliamentarian Lauer responded that he thinks only a couple of representatives are supporting this proposal.

Senator Allison remarked that the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Council submitted a report on proposed mergers for that college, and the Executive Committee decided not to bring it forward to the full Senate at this time. She observed that the ExCo minutes state that "Arts and Sciences continues to discuss reorganization," but she wonders who is discussing this. Chairperson Pynes thinks the upper administration and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences are talking about how to move forward; the College will need to have a discussion next year about how they want to reorganize, but their reorganization is not happening this academic year.

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

Mr. Markey reported that SGA at its last meeting voted on a funding proposal from its Council on Student Activities Funds, which funds all organizations on campus, including Casa Latina, the Gwendolyn Brooks Cultural Center, and departmental organizations. Mr. Markey told senators that, due to a number of factors, the amount funded will be a lot less than organizations have received before. He warned senators that if they advise an organization or if their department has an organization that receives activities funds, those organizations will probably receive a lot less than what they requested. Dr. Thompson asked if this is because the student fees that fund these organizations are enrollment driven; Mr. Markey replied affirmatively. Senator Bellott, who serves on the Council on Student Activities Funds, told senators the problem is twofold because a large fraction of the money is set aside for salaries that are paid from student fees, and that amount stayed the same, which leaves a much smaller pool of funds for other things.

D. Other Announcements

Chairperson Pynes announced that the Board of Trustees (BOT) agenda has not been made public. He asked for it again today but was told they are still working on it. Chairperson Pynes is not inclined to have another meeting next week, or in June for the July BOT meeting, unless there is something dramatic on the agenda. He observed that the only thing Faculty Senate is likely to have any concern about is the proposed program eliminations, and the Senate can talk about those today and make conditional recommendations about them. Chairperson Pynes will send everyone the agenda when it comes out, but reiterated that he is not inclined to have another meeting.

II. Reports of Committees and Councils

A. Council on Campus Planning and Usage (CCPU)
(Erin Taylor, Chair)

1. Peer Institutions Recommendation

Chairperson Pynes told senators the CCPU Chair was unable to attend today's meeting, and he told the CCPU Vice Chair he did not have to attend either. He related that the Executive Committee asked CCPU to produce a peer institutions list since WIU has changed dramatically over the past few years. He told senators that CCPU said this was a difficult job and should be done by more than just CCPU members, and the CCPU Chair asked the Executive Committee if CCPU could make a process for determining peer institutions rather than a list of peer institutions. He added that the recommendation from

CCPU is for Faculty Senate to create an ad hoc committee to determine a peer institution list, and they provided some ideas for membership as well as a model for this process used by Central Michigan University.

Senator Boynton asked if Faculty Senate can get clarity on what the peer institution list would be used for – academic evaluations, UPI comparisons, or a Humanities list, for example – because wonders about the purpose of the list. Chairperson Pynes replied that currently the Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) website lists peer institutions for the Macomb and Quad Cities campuses, as well as UPI and civil service salary equity benchmark institutions (<http://www.wiu.edu/IRP/peerinstitutions.php>). He stated that ExCo thought that since the University is undergoing program reorganizations and looking at ways to move forward, one of the things groups often do is look at how peer institutions are doing things. He pointed out that some peer institutions can be somewhat aspirational and but others should be on point, but since WIU has decreased in size quite a bit ExCo thought that peer institutions needed to be reevaluated relative to academics. Chairperson Pynes stated that ideally this is about the academic functioning of the university; the peer institutions get used in many ways by the administration, including in terms of accreditation, so it is important for the list to include genuine peers.

Senator Boynton was confused and concerned regarding why there are only six faculty and eight other people on the proposed membership of the ad hoc committee when this is an academic process. She wonders why faculty are outnumbered by those who are non-faculty. Chairperson Pynes replied that the proposal parallels the process used at Central Michigan, but if Senator Boynton thinks there should be more faculty on the ad hoc committee then Faculty Senate can have that discussion. He explained that Faculty Senate is not voting on creating the ad hoc committee today; today's meeting is to determine if an ad hoc committee is desired; if so, the committee would be generated at the first fall Senate meeting. He noted that senators can accept the CCPU report without generating the ad hoc committee at this time. Chairperson Pynes added that he has already heard two recommendations for additional members, one of which is that IRP be involved, whether as ex-officio or voting member, because that office provides a lot of data, and they are sensitive about how data works and how institutions are compared in ways that many people may not be aware. Interim Provost Clow also suggested that a representative from civil service be included. Chairperson Pynes stated that this document makes a recommendation for an ad hoc committee, and ExCo would put a proposal together for a vote in the fall.

Senator Cordes recalled that when he worked on this process as part of Higher Values in Higher Education, they looked at residential campuses and commuter campuses, and he does not see that as a recommendation. He pointed out that another consideration is size – more than 14,000 and less than 25,000 – and he also does not see that included. Chairperson Pynes explained that what CCPU has provided is just a model that Faculty Senate can use.

NO OBJECTION TO AD HOC COMMITTEE INCLUDING MEMBERSHIP FROM IRP AND CIVIL SERVICE

Senator Boynton encouraged the Executive Committee to think about what sort of balance might be wanted on an ad hoc committee that will consider peer institutions for academics. Parliamentarian Lauer pointed out that the list should not only consider academic peer institutions and is not based solely on academics. Senator Boynton stated that decisions are made about what programs to cancel based on peer institutions, and this has been happening already. Parliamentarian Lauer recalled that those comparative institutions were not peer institutions, which was a point that was brought up, but it was impossible to identify a central list of peer institutions that were being used to make decisions when these arguments were being made. He agrees that a better list would certainly help with academic reorganization, and it would be good to have robust faculty participation, but the issue is larger than simply faculty. Senator Allison seconded Senator Boynton's concerns,

having used peer institutions multiple times for things like Gen Ed models. She believes it really matters who the institution is being compared to, and people in academics think about the programs differently than others. She realizes that the list of peer institutions is used for more than academics, but if using it for academics, it is important that a broad sense of WIU's academic values are represented and selected for that list.

Chairperson Pynes suspects that there could also be multiple lists generated by the ad hoc committee. He is sympathetic to the concerns expressed but pointed out that the ad hoc committee would have to give a report and that report would have to be accepted by Faculty Senate. He promised it will not be an opaque process and that there will be a conversation about including more faculty in the ad hoc committee membership.

NO OBJECTION TO REPORT

III. Old Business

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

Chairperson Pynes pointed out that senators now have vote totals in the way that Faculty Senate had asked of them, and they have heard before why the two departments want to merger. Jack Elfrink, Interim Dean of the College of Business and Technology, observed that both departments made the decision to allow Unit B faculty to participate in the voting, which is reflected on the documentation. Chairperson Pynes stated that while Faculty Senate realizes that departments have different cultures and some allow this, the policy specifies only Unit A votes, which is why the Senate asked for that. Department of Accounting and Finance Chair Gregg Woodruff pointed out that in the faculty contract it says that Unit A faculty can extend the right to vote to Unit B faculty in their departments. He observed that faculty and the University recently accepted this new contract. He does not believe that a ten-year old policy should supersede a contract that was recently agreed upon and voted on by the University faculty as a whole. Dr. Woodruff observed that in one of the most important decisions for individual programs across the University it has been stated that those most impacted do not have a vote, and he thinks this is the opposite of what was negotiated at the table. He would like to hear from colleagues who were at that negotiating table.

CAGAS Chair Rich Filipink observed that the policy for creation of schools was created in 2005. Chairperson Pynes related that it was created because there were some issues with creation of schools previously that did not go through faculty oversight. Dr. Thompson explained that sometimes those with associate faculty status were allowed to participate in portfolio review, which would be an example of a contractual moment when Unit A faculty could allow Unit B faculty to be on the departmental personnel committee and be part of the review process. He thought this was the case for the Department of English, but Senator Allison clarified that Unit B faculty in English vote on everything else except that. Dr. Thompson believes this language addresses contractual types of votes. Dr. Filipink, who serves as the grievance officer for UPI, stressed that the Union is not objecting to the process being used. He advised that if the department has an objection to this they should take it up with Faculty Senate or the Provost's office.

Senator Rahman observed that it seems that Faculty Senate is just doing what the Provost's office says to do in these cases. She has no objection to hearing from Unit B about anything, but that is not what this issue is about. She stated that Faculty Senate is just trying to do things in a consistent manner; if other departments are informing Faculty Senate what Unit A thinks about the proposals, senators also what want to hear from Unit A in Dr. Woodruff's department. Senator Rahman observed that only five out of the nine Unit A faculty in the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences voted, and three voted no with two voting yes. Senator Boynton stated that whether Unit B is counted or not, in Economics and Decision Sciences the majority were against the merger; Interim Dean Elfrink confirmed that is correct. Senator Allison said this is her concern as well, adding that Faculty Senate is only doing what the Provost's policy says.

Chairperson Pynes stated that it is because the University did not have a policy about reorganization and the merging of departments that the administration and Senate Executive Committee agreed at an Academic Reorganization Task Force meeting to use the policy for creation of a school, which was created and agreed to in good times, to handle the current process. He stated that it is not just that Faculty Senate is following what the policy says; the administration and ExCo agreed that this policy is the closest the University has to something that is reasonable which was agreed to when these things were not being debated, so this policy was adapted for these mergers. He thinks it is unfair to say that Faculty Senate is following the Provost's policy because that policy was agreed to by Faculty Senate in the past and signed off on by the President for the creation of schools, and this policy is being adapted because there is no policy for the creation of mergers. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that in the current case the proposal is for a merger *and* creation of a school, just as he interprets the merger of Engineering and Engineering Technology as both a merger of two units and creation of a new School of Engineering and Engineering Technology, and this is the closest agreed upon policy to use in these cases.

Senator Allison believes that Senator Boynton's point that a majority of Economics and Decision Sciences faculty voted "no" is even more important. She said their numbers seem to be subsumed because they are a smaller department, and it concerns her that when the Senate is discussing mergers the smaller numbers look less important, even though the majority within those smaller departments said "no," and she thinks this is something that Faculty Senate needs to discuss.

Economics and Decision Sciences Chair Tara Feld told senators that the vote was held quite a while ago with imperfect information about its significance, and there has not been a revote; there were discussions about the possibility of squeezing in another vote between the two Senate meetings, but there was not time. She and Dr. Woodruff talked to their entire faculty casually about how they feel, and the sense is that they would like to maintain their independence and autonomy, but they understand the fiscal reality of the situation. She added that if Economics and Decision Sciences has to be merged with some area, Accounting and Finance makes sense. Dr. Feld told senators that the two departments have complimentary programs and have already worked together on business accreditation and other kinds of proposals. She does not think her faculty are really fearful or worried about the merger, but that is really all she can say.

Senator Bellot observed that in the report from the College of Business and Technology to Faculty Senate on April 26, the last page indicates that Economics and Decision Sciences has 11 faculty members, and today's report shows they have six. He asked if five faculty members have retired. Interim Dean Elfrink clarified that the page provided to senators for today's meeting indicated how many voted. Senator Bellott asked if this means that only six out of 11 voted in Economics and Decision Sciences and 13 out of 15 voted in Accounting and Finance. Interim Dean Elfrink thinks that this reflects the overall feeling about the merger. He stressed it is necessary to get the merger done, but nobody is excited about it, and that shows in the turnout for the vote and in the voting results. He thinks everyone agrees that both units are cohesive.

Senator Rahman thinks the chairs of the departments have a responsibility to talk to the faculty about the vote and encourage them to vote. She is concerned that three Unit A faculty voted "no" and two voted "yes," and she is also concerned that only five out of nine voted and many faculty did not vote at all. Senator Rahman pointed out that the chairs of the departments have come before Faculty Senate twice to effectively say that the merger is not great but is okay, but that is not what she sees from the faculty vote. She thinks it is the responsibility of the chairs to have their faculty tell the Senate what they think because otherwise all senators have is the result of the vote and nothing else.

Senator Allison is also concerned about taking a vote when there is incomplete information. She related that a different department had real concerns about voting on something that was in draft form. She is sympathetic as a faculty member to not voting because it is concerning to be asked to vote on something that is a draft, but it is important for Faculty Senate to know the votes of the faculty. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Sue Martinelli-Fernandez clarified that actually the department being referenced did not have the draft at the time the vote was taken, although she had talked through everything that was on the draft; the draft was provided after she spoke with all of

the departments in her college. She explained the vote was predicated on that document, but faculty did not have a document to reference at that time because she was working on it and bringing it to the Provost's office and to committee. Senator Allison observed this means that faculty really did not know what they were voting on. Senator Bellott suggested that Faculty Senate concentrate its discussion on the current proposal.

Interim Dean Elfrink stated that in this case the faculty have the draft, and there have only been small changes. Senator Boynton asked if faculty have all seen the proposal for creation of a new department/school and had the document to review before they voted. Dr. Feld responded they did not; the proposal was being worked on simultaneously to the voting.

College of Education and Human Services Assistant Dean Greg Montalvo observed that the vote totals have been presented to Faculty Senate, and he wonders what the Senate is supposed to do. Chairperson Pynes responded that ideally Faculty Senate was to have voted to approve or not to approve the new merger and school, but the policy says there has to be a positive vote of the majority of the Unit A faculty. He observed that Senators Rahman and Allison are now asking whether it is relevant that one department is significantly bigger and can outweigh the other department, which is where the discussion stands at present. Chairperson Pynes stated that at any point someone could make a motion to approve, not approve, or table the proposal, but right now this discussion is on the table.

Dr. Filipink pointed out that the policy says a majority of the total of Unit A faculty, not a majority of those that vote, so, mathematically speaking, neither department has a majority. Chairperson Pynes agreed, adding that this is why it was important for these faculty to vote. Dr. Woodruff pointed out that there were a significant number of Unit A faculty whose last day at the University was a week ago and who indicated that they did not feel they should vote about the direction the program should go moving forward. Dr. Filipink believes this should probably have been reflected in the number of total faculty, and if the number is incorrect it should have been corrected before the report came to Faculty Senate. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that the number can be corrected now if there is a new correct number for total Unit A faculty in the two departments; Interim Dean Elfrink said that number is 20. Senator Boynton asked how many of the 20 will be coming back in the fall. Dr. Feld responded that no Unit A are leaving from the Department of Economics and Decision Sciences, so they will have 10; Dr. Woodruff added that there will be eight in the Department of Accounting and Finance in the fall.

Motion: To table until the next Faculty Senate meeting (Rahman/Boynton)

Senator Rahman would like the proposal tabled until the fall when faculty come back because she does not think senators are really hearing from them. She thinks senators would have to vote "no" based on the information they are hearing, and that if the proposal were tabled until a summer meeting, the faculty would not be available to provide that needed information.

Mr. Markey asked if faculty should come to Faculty Senate if they have a problem with the proposal. He related that when program eliminations were announced, SGA had students come to their meetings, but none of the faculty in these departments have come to Faculty Senate to say what their problems are, which would seem to show they are not necessarily against the proposal. Chairperson Pynes stated that some of the faculty not voting was their protest to show that the vote did not matter, but Interim Provost Clow pointed out that this is conjecture.

Senator Maskarinec asked what the down side would be of tabling the proposal. He observed that Faculty Senate has this request to merge, but there are other requests that have not yet made it to Faculty Senate, and the current proposal is disquieting to senators. He thinks there needs to be an "or else," and asked what the "or else" would be if this merger does not happen. Interim Provost Clow replied that the way the College is organized there will possibly be no chair in Economics and Decision Sciences; Interim Dean Elfrink confirmed this position has been removed from the proposed budget so there will be chair for this department after July 1. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that the University has processes for handling this, and associate deans have filled in when

chairs have been absent before. Provost Clow stated that, in this instance, to not approve the merger leaves one department sort of in limbo.

Parliamentarian Lauer, speaking in favor of tabling, remarked that if senators had a higher degree of confidence in the validity of the vote with more buy-in from faculty, the conjectures by everyone would tend to fade away. Senator Bellott remarked that he would not like to see the report come back as is in the fall. He is okay with splitting Unit A and Unit B out, but he thinks senators need to know how many faculty will be in the departments in the fall, and a majority of those need to vote “yes.” Interim Dean Elfrink stated that if the departments are to revote, he would like to have everything laid out for them and know how votes are to be counted. Chairperson Pynes remarked that the Senate Recording Secretary sent Interim Dean Elfrink the policy for creation of a school, and that policy is fairly straightforward in specifying that Unit A are to vote, so that is what Faculty Senate expected. He offered to send Interim Dean Elfrink a more detailed view of what has been learned over the last two meetings if desired.

Dr. Woodruff observed that senators have been concerned about big department/small department issues rather than a total vote. He stated that if senators come to a consensus about what they need to have done to have a formal vote or document that senators can rely on, that would be really helpful. He told senators that faculty have indicated they are fully prepared to merge, and they understand the economic necessity. He said the departments have already looked at synergies and ways to leverage their strengths. Dr. Woodruff admitted that when the original votes were conducted, people did not understand where the request to vote was coming from – Sherman Hall or Faculty Senate – and they were frustrated and thought it was a waste of time. He believes a good policy should be developed that says that only Unit A faculty are to vote and whether that vote is to be by paper ballot or electronic ballot so that the College does not have to come back to Faculty Senate missing information and take up another two to three hours of the Senate’s time. Dr. Woodruff encouraged senators to make progress and come to a consensus, then send the College the information that senators want to get so that they can then go back and visit with their faculty.

Senator Boynton stressed that the College needs to make sure that their faculty have the proposal that they are voting on. Interim Dean Elfrink replied there was inconsistency on the request form because he thought it was only supposed to go from the College to the Interim Provost. Senator Boynton stated that faculty would have had to have something written specifically so that they would know what they were voting on. She thinks it is important that all faculty are voting on the same thing, and stressed that having something written down for them would be helpful. Chairperson Pynes observed that it seems senators have completed their discussion about the motion to table, so if there are no other comments on that motion the vote can be taken and the process discussed separately at another time.

MOTION TO TABLE APPROVED 10 YES – 2 NO – 0 ABSTENTIONS

V. New Business

A. Proposal to Merge the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Department of Educational Studies to Create a New School

Educational Studies Chair Eric Sheffield asked if Faculty Senate’s involvement in this process is because of the word “school.” He asked if two departments were put together in the same way and called a “department,” whether that would mean that Faculty Senate would not be involved. Chairperson Pynes responded that Faculty Senate would still be involved because there has been an agreement made with the administration that the approval from faculty will come to this body. He explained that because there was no actual formalized process, the administration agreed that mergers of departments would be treated the same way as creation of schools. Dr. Sheffield asked if this language is in the policy. Senator Boynton pointed out that the form’s title is Request for Creation of New Department/School.

College of Education and Human Services Interim Dean Katrina Daytner told senators the Department of Curriculum and Instruction had 12 faculty in the spring semester; one was Unit B, and one Unit A faculty member is retiring and did not vote, so ten were eligible to vote. Of those ten, four voted “yes,” one voted “no,” and five did not vote at all. She stated that Educational Studies had 19 faculty in the spring; one was Unit B, and one Unit A is resigning and chose not to vote, so there were 17 eligible voters. Of those 17, 14 voted “yes” and three did not vote.

Senator Allison expressed a concern that five of the ten eligible Curriculum and Instruction faculty chose not to vote. Interim Dean Daytner asked what Faculty Senate’s recommendation is to ensure that all ten individuals vote. She understands the concern that people may not be voting because they do not agree with the proposal, but faculty cannot be forced to vote. She added that the two department chairs have worked very hard to get their faculty the information.

Curriculum and Instruction Chair Laura Frey said that after hearing the discussion regarding the College of Business and Technology proposal, she would not like for that line of reasoning to be used with this case. She told senators it became apparent in July 2018 that there would be a School of Education with the merger of the Departments of Educational Studies and Curriculum and Instruction, and the two department chairs began to inform their faculty in August. She stated that in October 2018 it became clear that this would be the inevitable situation. She said the two departments have always worked as a team, but they really went into “team mode” in the early fall and started to discuss becoming a School of Education. Dr. Frey told senators that faculty from the two departments were brought together in this room before the end of the fall semester to discuss how to move forward as a team. The two department chairs met with the combined faculty again early in the spring to gather their input, ideas, and suggestions. Dr. Frey stated that after taking those notes, the department chairs asked faculty to take about another week to think about what other positive, negative, or neutral comments they might have and send those to the Educational Studies office manager anonymously. She said those comments were typed up verbatim and sent out to the faculty to review, and all this occurred before faculty were asked to vote.

Dr. Frey related that there were no significant negative concerns; all of the concerns have been along the lines of indecisiveness, and she thinks faculty are ready to come together as a School of Education. She believes faculty in the two departments want to move forward and continue to develop new initiatives and quality programs. She stressed that the indecisiveness faculty have gone through, and which they will continue to go through if this proposal is tabled, is detrimental to the students they serve and the quality of their programs. Dr. Frey suspects some individuals may not have voted because they saw themselves as a School of Education already. She stated that although part of this merger been inevitable and far from ideal, the two departments have worked together as a team for months, see themselves as a School of Education, and are ready to move forward, so tabling the proposal would be a significant detriment all around. Dr. Frey told senators that she, Dr. Sheffield, Interim Dean Daytner, Interim Associate Dean Lorette Oden, and Assistant Dean Greg Montalvo have worked as a team to ensure maximum transparency for the faculty. She stressed that faculty want to move forward as a School of Education for the purpose of quality programs and clarity during the summer so that they have an entity to plan on and call themselves by July 1 and can tell their students and stakeholders.

Senator Rahman observed that this situation is completely different than the others because in this case there is not a “no” vote from one of the departments. Senator Allison, however, was not sure the situations are very different. Senator Allison observed that Dr. Frey is saying that everyone is so on board with the proposed merger that they did not vote, and she has trouble believing that. She said that Faculty Senate has talked about a lot of issues where things appeared to be one way and were actually something else. She does not care if the two departments merge, but she thinks the numbers do not say “We are a team and want to be together”; instead, they say that half of the people in one department did not vote, and that is a type of vote. She said that while senators can speculate what that vote means, it is a kind of vote. Chairperson Pynes asked what Senator Allison would do if there were ten faculty in each department and the vote was 6 yes – 4 did not vote and 5 yes – 5 did not vote. He pointed out that the policy specifies a majority but does not say there must be a majority in both departments. He stated that if this weaker case would get Senator Allison’s vote, then the stronger actual case should also get her support. Senator Allison replied that her

concern is not with the “yes” votes but with the total faculty voting in the department. Senator Boynton pointed out that four of 12 voted in favor of the proposal in Curriculum and Instruction.

Senator Delany-Barmann pointed out that one other piece for context is that on July 1 the Department of Curriculum and Instruction will no longer have a chair because Dr. Frey is retiring. She recognizes that it is a forced marriage but wonders who will be the chair, schedule courses, and put out fires because there is a lot that needs to be happening in their departments across the University, and it is important that somebody be there. Senator Boynton pointed out that this happens all the time in departments, and often associate deans or a chair from another department is asked to serve as acting chair.

Senator McIlvaine-Newsad observed that the language Dr. Frey used in the beginning of her statement was very telling: “It was very apparent that this was going to happen.” She said this tells her that this is a forced marriage where perhaps people are taking into consideration that this is the reality that they have right now. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad does not know how she feels about this because she comes from a department where her voice does not matter and her discipline is outnumbered, but she thinks Dr. Frey said a lot in the beginning of her statement. Dr. Frey stated that what she wanted to build on is the question of what a leader can do when repeatedly told that “You will reorganize.” She said that in this case you must take your leadership and, with a strong colleague, say that they will now do their due diligence and move forward with maximum transparency to have a joint positive educational environment ready to go on July 1 because there is no other option being provided to them. Dr. Frey told senators that she and Dr. Sheffield were consistently told by senior administration “This is what will happen,” so they ethically did their due diligence and included the faculty in making plans, and they are still making plans. Dr. Frey told senators that she and Dr. Sheffield have a framework together and have created a merger committee that has eight faculty members. She acknowledges that the process has been less than ideal but said that it must move forward with ethics and understanding, and she believes the continual indecision is worse. She understands the concern that five Curriculum and Instruction faculty did not vote, but it seems as the work that has been done, including the frontline understanding that she and Dr. Sheffield have developed, is of less importance. She does not know what else she should have done as a leader when she was told from the July 2018 Board of Trustees meeting all the way through that this is going to happen; she asked if she should have sat on her hands and done nothing while hoping it would not come true. Dr. Frey stated that faculty in the two departments have worked hard and are committed to joining in planning with their colleagues, and she would not like to have the two departments sit and wait until August because five faculty did not vote when, as Mr. Markey pointed out, none of those faculty have expressed any concerns. Dr. Frey said she is concerned as a leader as to how she can help in her remaining five weeks if this proposal is to be tabled and believes this is better for the faculty and students that are going to be returning because there is no office manager for one of the departments.

Senator Bellott asked what the composition is of the merger committee; Dr. Sheffield replied it is made up of four Curriculum and Instruction and four Educational Studies faculty members. Interim Dean Daytner asked senators if they expect the College to get every faculty member from Curriculum and Instruction in a room and make sure that all ten vote. She said that if this is the only way the College can assure approval from Faculty Senate for the merger, they need to know that. Chairperson Pynes stated that he would say to all of the groups who are going through this process that last July when the reorganization announcement was made, all faculty were surprised, although the administration at the time believed and sincerely thought faculty had been in on these decisions before that point. He stated that faculty disagreed, and this body has fought for a process so that faculty could have input; even though some faculty did not think that their input would be heard, Faculty Senate fought hard to make sure their voices would be heard. Chairperson Pynes is sympathetic that both groups – the previous departments and those being considered currently – are psychologically prepared for their mergers, and he really thinks some of this confusion has to do with the fact that there was a mandate and then faculty fought back for their voice in the actual structure and running of the University. He suspects perhaps this was not communicated far enough down to the faculty who are voting for these mergers, which is unfortunate. The way Chairperson Pynes sees the current proposal is that the policy says there is to be a majority.

Motion: To approve the proposed merger and creation of a school (Delany-Barmann/Tasdan)

Senator Boynton remarked she is more supportive of this proposal because there is a majority in both departments of those voting, while in the previous proposal the majority in one department said “no.” She added that even though it is a minority of the total faculty who said “yes,” it is a majority of those that voted. Senator Allison said she feels that she is advocating for the faculty who may not feel comfortable coming forward. She observed that the atmosphere on this campus has silenced many people; Senator Allison often hears from faculty that she said something they would not have, and she will continue to speak up, although she may be outvoted. She thinks until the University attains a climate where individuals think that their vote matters, the Senate is faced with interpreting what these numbers mean, and if half of a department did not vote, that is a vote.

Chairperson Pynes asked when the vote was taken; Interim Dean Daytner replied it was taken the last week of April. Chairperson Pynes pointed out that this was before the meeting where Faculty Senate tried to clear this process up, so some of the lack of voting may have been just a communication problem. Senator Cordes asked how the Senate is treating abstentions since a lot rides on these votes. Chairperson Pynes replied that the logic of an abstention when it is a total vote of a total known group logically functions as a “no” vote, but the question is the total of Unit A faculty in both departments, so because there are enough “yes” votes for a majority, it does not matter. Senator Cordes pointed out that if Faculty Senate has to go through this process again it should be outlined for senators so that everyone knows how votes are to be tabulated and so that people submitting these proposals know how their votes will be treated when they get to Faculty Senate. Chairperson Pynes stated that a request to reevaluate the creation of a school document is something that Faculty Senate can do at the beginning of next year. He is sure that the new Provost and other departments would be more than happy to see that policy cleaned up. Senator Tarrant asked if the majority is based on combined or individual totals; Chairperson Pynes responded it is based on combined totals. Senator Tarrant said he thought the previous proposal showed a majority when the totals were combined, but Senator Bellott responded that his figures show 42 percent and 35 percent from Unit A from the earlier totals.

MOTION TO MERGE TO CREATE A SCHOOL OF EDUCATION APPROVED 12 YES – 1 NO – 0 ABSTENTIONS

B. Board of Trustees Consent Agenda Action Items

1. Proposed Program Eliminations

Chairperson Pynes told senators that he did not receive the BOT consent agenda, but Kerry McBride in the President’s office said that one agenda item would be the elimination of academic programs. He stated that even though senators do not have the actual agenda, they can decide if they want to consent to the proposed changes.

Chairperson Pynes stated that the original elimination list from the Provost’s website (<http://www.wiu.edu/provost/>) has been regrouped for senators’ packets. He noted that the first four programs – Nutrition, Bilingual/Bicultural Education, French Teacher Education, and Spanish Teacher Education – indicate that there is no faculty reduction associated with them, so they may not be contentious. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad remarked that there was a faculty reduction in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, so she is unclear as to how there is no faculty reduction indicated. Interim Provost Clow responded that this particular layoff was part of the review of all the programs and not connected with the teacher education part of the department. Chairperson Pynes asked if this faculty reduction was an issue associated with student credit hour (SCH) production; Interim Provost Clow confirmed this is correct. Senator McIlvaine-Newsad asked if that Unit B faculty member did not deliver any courses related to Spanish Teacher Education. Interim Provost Clow replied there is only one course.

Senator Boynton asked if the resolution Faculty Senate passed about teacher education programs was sent to the Board of Trustees; Dr. Montalvo responded that it was sent to

Interim Provost Clow. Chairperson Pynes responded that he has not yet sent that off, and Senator Boynton said she would like Trustees to receive that document. She wonders why opportunities for students to do teacher education are being eliminated if there are no faculty reductions. Interim Provost Clow replied the administration is required every year to report out enrollment totals for all programs. Senator Boynton pointed out that the requirement is not to eliminate but to report out; the decision to eliminate is up to the university. Interim Provost Clow stated that enrollment has been very low in all of these programs. Chairperson Pynes remarked that this used to be called the low enrollment report but it was changed to the low productivity report, and these are, in the view of the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), low producing programs. He stated that thinking of it as low production makes people want to get rid of these programs in a different way than calling them low enrolled.

Senator McIlvaine-Newsad said she would like to reiterate something she stated at the last Faculty Senate meeting which is that with the changing demographic population in the state of Illinois it makes absolutely no sense to eliminate any of these teacher education programs that deal with a different language. She thinks to do so is just dumb. Senator Delany-Barmann corrected the Provost's list by stating that her program is called Bilingual/ESL Education, not Bilingual/Bicultural Education. She confirmed that these are areas of high need in our state; Illinois has the fifth largest English language learner population in the nation, with 144 different languages being spoken in Illinois schools, so these teachers are much needed. She stated that to call these low producing programs is just smoke and mirrors because there are well over 100 students enrolled in spring classes in her program, so the need is there.

Senator Allison stated that Senator Delany-Barmann's point is well taken. She thinks the elimination of these programs harkens back to the elimination of African American Studies and Women's Studies; WIU has this population on campus, and students will take these classes, although they are not majoring in them. She thinks eliminating these programs sends a really negative signal to anybody who has any concerns in this area and is a PR mistake. Senator Delany-Barmann thinks eliminating these programs is discouraging to their students and discouraging to donors. She received an email from a donor yesterday who wants to award \$5,500 to one of her program's students. She wonders what will happen with this donor when WIU no longer has a program.

Senator Boynton stated that the University Committee for Educator Preparation (UCEP) passed a resolution similar to the one passed by Faculty Senate and added something about Art Education. She noted that a lot of parents do not want to send their students to study Art at a school that does not also offer Art Education as kind of a backup plan. She thinks Art Education makes Art as a whole more attractive and reassuring to parents and students, and if that is eliminated many students will not come to WIU to study Art either.

Interim Provost Clow explained that for Bilingual/ESL, the idea was that the ESL portion of the program would stay and only the Bilingual part of the program would be eliminated. Senator Delany-Barmann stressed that there is a need for bilingual teachers, too. She had not understood this differentiation in what was to be eliminated.

Senator Asare observed that the list shows that French, Spanish, and Art Teacher Education are options within other programs. He stated that these options have not yet been given any time to develop and in the case of French and Spanish Teacher Education options have not even started. He wonders, in this case, what the elimination is based on. Interim Provost Clow responded the eliminations are based on enrollments and history; there have been no students enrolling in these programs. Senator Boynton pointed out that the proposal beginning this fall is to have French and Spanish Teacher Education programs be options in the Foreign Languages major, so their numbers would be counted toward that one major, but that has not even started yet. Senator Rahman agreed this point is well noted if these options would not even start until the fall. Chairperson Pynes related the idea was to move these programs under one major so that they can be counted together

rather than as four different majors (French, Spanish, French Teacher Education, Spanish Teacher Education) counted separately. He said part of the reason that these programs were not controversial was because students would still have options within the new major to take these programs. Senator Boynton, however, countered that these options are being eliminated; Foreign Languages moved these options under their major but are now being told these options are still going to be eliminated. Chairperson Pynes said he had misunderstood that.

Chairperson Pynes stated that senators can vote on each program individually, in groups, or as a whole. Senator Bellott thinks it would make more sense to object to the agenda item rather than to which eliminations Faculty Senate agrees or does not agree with. Chairperson Pynes explained that usually the BOT has a separate agenda item for each proposed elimination. He thinks the proposed elimination of Nutrition, for example, may not be controversial because it is being moved into Dietetics, which is being retained as is. Recreation, Parks and Tourism Administration professor Jeremy Robinett corrected that the program has actually been called Nutrition and Food Service Management since 2015. He said the Provost's office has made the decision that those majors should not be treated as new programs, even though the IBHE continues to have the department do a report on them as new programs. He said the department was opposed to this major going away because it had become the fallback major for those students that did not pass a certain exam required for Dietetics or who did not meet that GPA, but it was not an accredited major and does not need to be preserved. Kinesiology Chair Renee Polubinsky confirmed there is no loss if the Nutrition and Food Services Management major is eliminated because that major is built into others. Dr. Robinett said the major was a combination of nutrition and hospitality courses which would be available to those students who were not eligible to become registered dietitians. Chairperson Pynes asked what these students will do now. Dr. Robinett responded they could finish Dietetics, go into Exercise Science, or pursue a Bachelor of General Studies or another major.

Chairperson Pynes stated that there is at least one program (Nutrition and Food Service Management) that may not have any objections to its elimination. Senator Rahman asked if senators could vote on the other three together. Senator Allison asked the audience if there are other programs on the list that they would not object to seeing eliminated. Chairperson Pynes read the list aloud:

Recommendation	Program
Eliminate (no faculty reduction)	Nutrition and Food Service Management
Eliminate (no faculty reduction)	Bilingual/ESL Education
Eliminate (no faculty reduction)	French Teacher Education*
Eliminate (no faculty reduction)	Spanish Teacher Education*
Eliminate	Art Teacher Education *
Eliminate	Graphic Communication
Eliminate	Hospitality Management
Eliminate	Emergency Management
Revise program (including faculty reduction)	Meteorology
Revise program (including faculty reduction)	Geology
Eliminate undergraduate degree	Public Health
Eliminate undergraduate degree	Geography/GIS
Retain program (as is; faculty reduction)	Economics

Retain program (as is; faculty reduction)	Physics
Retain program (as is)	Dietetics
Retain program (as is)	Anthropology
Retain program (as is)	Musical Theatre
Retain program (as is)	Clinical Lab Science

* Options within a degree program

Senator McIlvaine-Newsad pointed out that Public Health and Geography/GIS also have faculty reductions, which is not indicated on the Provost's office list. Chairperson Pynes stated that there are essentially ten proposed eliminations and eight revised programs, and he suspects that the only programs that will actually be on the BOT agenda are those that are proposed to be eliminated, not those that are to be retained. Senator Rahman asked what will happen to the programs that are retained with faculty reductions. Chairperson Pynes replied he does not think the BOT has to vote on these; the Provost's office can just report them.

Motion: To object to all program eliminations except Nutrition/Food Service Management and to all faculty reductions that came out of the revision of programs (Rahman/Asare)

Senator Delany-Barmann remarked that there is a Unit B faculty member in Spanish who has been laid off. She does not believe that one class constitutes Spanish Teacher Education; all Spanish students take some certain level of Spanish, and Dan Brown does not teach them all. She would like to see that faculty reduction reflected on the list rather than it stating "no faculty reduction" for Spanish Teacher Education. Chairperson Pynes observed the Interim Provost says that the elimination of the option is not the cause of that faculty reduction which was because of SCH. He said the argument is that it is a demonstrable student enrollment reduction, and that is a different case.

Senator Rahman recalled that when President Thomas visited Faculty Senate last year, she pointed out to him that there have been a lot of faculty reductions and program eliminations over the past four years, but when students are asked why they come to WIU, according to Admissions, they respond that it is because of the programs and the faculty. Senator Rahman at the time asked President Thomas if there would be other kinds of eliminations and reductions across the campus. She noted that WIU is not involved in higher athletics but in higher education, and when education is repeatedly eliminated first, it feels like the University is not involved in higher education anymore, so she opposes faculty reductions. Chairperson Pynes stated that as the Chair of Faculty Senate, he consistently stands up to defend the faculty voice and gets a lot of grief when people disagree. He reminded senators that the administration has the right to reduce faculty if there are demonstrable student enrollment reductions, and the University has experienced about a 39 percent loss in the last 12 years. He stated that the administration can reduce Unit B and untenured faculty with a process that faculty may not like but have agreed to. He thinks that to object to those kinds of things would amount to basically yelling into the wind because there is nothing Faculty Senate can do about that, and it undercuts Faculty Senate's and Chairperson Pynes's ability to defend the things they have the responsibility to defend. Chairperson Pynes stated that while it may not be accurate to say that this reduction was because of enrollment, he thinks the Senate should stick with those things it has the strongest leg to stand on. He stated that while no one wants faculty reduced from the University, sometimes when a university is in decline there are some people who lose their jobs first. He recognizes that this is a terrible thing and encouraged everyone to focus on getting more students to try to bring those people back. Chairperson Pynes said he does not want to put Faculty Senate into a situation where senators are asking him as Chair to defend something that is essentially indefensible because it will make the Senate look bad. Senator Maskarinec added that the Interim Provost has said this layoff is a result of a demonstrable

drop in enrolment, which in that case is contractual. He noted that if this is not true, that is a Union issue, not a Faculty Senate issue, so he agrees with Chairperson Pynes that the Senate should stay out of this. Chairperson Pynes stressed that even if Faculty Senate does not like some of the things going on, the Senate must do what it *can* do.

Chairperson Pynes said the motion is to object to all program eliminations except Nutrition/Food Service Management and to all program revisions that resulted in faculty reductions. Senator Boynton asked if it is correct that Faculty Senate is objecting to 11 of the top 12 on the chart; Chairperson Pynes confirmed that is correct. He added that if this is not on the agenda the Senate's vote will just be noted in his report to the BOT.

MOTION APPROVED 10 YES – 1 NO – 0 ABSTENTIONS

C. For the Good of the Body

Senator Allison remarked that enrollment numbers seem to be good and asked if there are any enrollment updates. Admissions Associate Director Melissa Telles responded that SOAR registrations are up nine percent from the same time last year and housing contracts are up 12 percent, but there is still a long way to go, and Admissions is still trying to recruit. She added that these totals are up from last Friday's report.

Motion: To adjourn (Maskarinec)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Heather McIlvaine-Newsad, Senate Vice Chair

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary