

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,

andez, Rose McConnell,

Russ Morgan, Mark Mossman, Jill Myers, Kat Myers, Loretta

Robinett, Roger Runquist, Eric Sheffield, Melissa Telles, Bill

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,

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 compare

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

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

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 facu

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 thilalimik ~ ea g

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

pursu M g mov ni È M sA M

Retain program (as is; faculty reduction)	Physics
Retain program (as is)	Dietetics
Retain program (as is)	Anthropology

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