

MINUTES OF THE 2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE
December 12, 2017

ROLL CALL

Members present: Jason Bond, Alejandro Caceres, Kathleen Chwalisz, Sandra Collins, Jon Davey, Marissa Ellermann, Ahmad Fakhoury, Tobin Grant, Michael Hoane, Carolyn Kingcade, Bobbi Knapp, Michael Koehler, Jim MacLean, Nancy Martin, James Mathias, Michael May, Grant Miller, Marcus Odom, Segun Ojewuyi, Kyle Plunkett, Saikat Talapatra, Melissa Viernow, Jim Wall, Wendi Zea, Kay Zivkovich

Members absent with Proxy: Howard Motyl (Sarah Lewison), Elizabeth Cox (Matt Gorzalski proxy), Derek Fisher (Bethany Raider proxy), Constantine Hatziaioniu (Mohammad Sayeh proxy), Robert Spahr (Walter Metz proxy), Cherie Watson (Jennifer Horton proxy)

Members absent without Proxy: Jon Bean, Doug Carlson, Shawn Cheng, Sandra Ettema, Heeyoung Han, April Teske

Ex-Officios and guests: Carlo Montemagno (Chancellor), Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, APAP), Dave Dilalla (Associate Provost for Academic Administration), Julie Partridge (Graduate Council Vice Chair), Jennifer Smith, Tamara Workman, Mary Bricker

MINUTES

The minutes from November Senate meeting were presented for approval. S. Lewison made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; seconded by A. Caceres; minutes approved by voice vote with two abstentions.

REPORTS/REMARKS

1. **Faculty Senate President - K. Chwalisz** started by saying that the Executive Council will be reporting on some of the activities that the Executive Council has been working on in regard to managing the reorganization process. This is the point at which the rubber is going to hit the road as far as shared governance is concerned. There is going to be a lot of activity. We have been talking to UEPC about how to efficiently handle all of the proposals and program change plans that are going to be coming down the pike. We will be asking all of you to step up and help out. There is going to be a lot of work to be done to review all of those proposals. We have also been working with the Co-Provosts on developing a system to track what is happening with each of these units as they travel through this process; who's had meetings and when, who's had changes to proposals that they have presented, and various aspects of this process. Chwalisz continued by saying the Executive Council had a resolution regarding a process to track the process and discovered that some of the language was a little confusing. That resolution will be withdrawn for now. We are working on procedures to do that and have talked about it with the Co-Provosts. Chwalisz added that she would like to discuss an item that she has been bringing up every month which is what is the role of the Faculty Senate during the reorganization. Chwalisz stated that she would like to discuss that today under old business if there is time.

- 2a. **Chancellor Montemagno** opened by saying Happy Holiday greetings to everyone. The reorganization is going forward. The Board of Trustees will be getting a briefing on the reorganization on Wednesday, December 13, 2017 and officially presenting it to the Board on Thursday, December 14, 2017. Montemagno stated that he had the first meeting with one of the proposed schools on Monday, December 11, 2017. Other proposed schools will be contacted. Programs that may divided to more than one school will be invited to attend multiple meetings. Montemagno stated that he views these meetings as a way to help identify concerns as a community and create a sense of community among individuals as we move forward. As a result of these discussions, there has been name changes to schools.

There has been changes of the movement of programs from one school to another. The dialog that we are engaging in is advancing and it is being done in a way that is collaborative. Montemagno stated that he is looking forward to working with all everyone as we move this agenda forward and added that he is certain that we are going to have a fully great and wonderful institution.

- 2b. **Provost Office - Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost)** Stated that she will just echo what the Chancellor has already stated and wished everyone a Happy Holiday and thank you for what you are doing; it's the end of the year; spend time with the ones that you love and come back rejuvenated.

Dave Dilalla (Associate Provost for Academic Administration, Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost) reported that he had a meeting with colleagues from the Faculty Association and had some frank and open discussion. Dilalla added that he would like to sit down again with the group and help bring some clarity to some questions that have come up with respect to procedure. We didn't all agree, but it was a good meeting. We hope to have some feedback soon that will help bring some clarity. Dilalla continued by saying that sabbatical applications will be reviewed and finalized at the Provost's level. The Provost's office will send a letter to the faculty member with the Provost's determination. There will be final Board of Trustees action at the April meeting. Promotion and tenure college level recommendations are all in and dossiers transferred to the Provost's level. Promotion and tenure are also on the April Board meeting agenda.

3. **Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Matt McCarroll** No Report. K. Chwalisz reported that SIU Carbondale will be hosting the February meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council.
4. **Graduate Council – Julie Partridge** reported that the Council passed 3 resolutions; Resolution in Support of Ph.D. Changes in Geology, Resolution in Support of Waiving the TOEFL Requirement for Applicants Holding a Master's degree from an Accredited Institution in the United States, and a Resolution Opposing Universal Elimination of Academic Departments. Partridge added that there was discussion about the joint ad hoc committee regarding graduate teaching; it was suggested to talk to the Law School about having representation on that committee; the Graduate Council representative from the Law School was consulted and felt that it was not necessary to have representation on that committee because Law students don't teach; it was also suggested to have Medical School representation; things are moving forward with Graduate School representation on the ad hoc committee.
5. **HLC Accreditation Committee – Ruth Ann Rehfeldt** – No report
6. **Judicial Review Board Annual Report** - ([Attachment A](#))
7. **Graduations Appeals Committee and Academic Calendar Committee** – ([Attachment B](#))
8. **Double Majors – Tamara Workman, Registrar's Office Director** – ([Attachment C](#))

T. Workman started by saying we find ourselves looking at this academic policy and the business practice associated with academic policy. As a result of our implementation of Degree Works audit system, prior to the implementation of the audit system which went live in August of 2016, this campus was an entirely manual clearance institution, there was no mechanism ensuring that curriculum rules were followed; and that the logic of those rules were in the system as they are approved by the 90A process. As any major system implementation will do, it will bring to our attention anomalies that occur. It is very customary that best business practices develop over time. Our academic policies are printed in a book; prior to the audit system, whether or not the individual reads the book or

understands and implements what is in the book has really been left to the individual academic units. If the individual academic unit interpreted a policy to mean A as opposed to B, there was no accountability in our process to ensure a standard understanding. So we find ourselves at this point with business practice that have gone on so long it has been assumed that it is policy. It is not. Workman continued by saying that she needs the Senate to look at and to either clarify if we want to continue that practice, do we want to adjust language in the catalog, or put together an entirely new policy. Workman added that she needs explicit guidelines.

T. Workman continued by saying the problem is that we have a practice called double major. There is a Dual Degree policy and a Second Bachelor's Degree policy. There is not a Double Major policy; it is a business practice that has gone on so long that the assumption is that we have a policy. Double Major on this campus looks like one diploma, same degree, two different majors. For example: College of Science, Bachelor's Degree, Plant Biology (Primary program) plus a college of Liberal Arts, Bachelor's Degree, Criminology and Criminal Justice; two majors, all of that done within 120 hours. Some colleges require that all college level requirements are met for both majors. Some of our academic units understand that the requirements for the primary program is the one that rules. So we have a mixed bag. With eight academic colleges currently on this campus, about half of them interpret it one way the other half interpret it the other way.

T. Workman explained that the Dual Degree is two different degree. (e.g. BA and BS, BS and BM)). All of those combinations exist; students do all kinds of combinations. The policy says a dual degree requires a minimum of 150 hours; the additional 30 hour per additional degree; it implies that the student is going to complete those degree simultaneously. The Second Bachelor's Degree policy require the student will complete consecutive degree; the student already has a Bachelor's degree and come to us for a second degree; they are going to do an additional 30 hours. The practices that we see are that we have students who are coded in the system to complete a double major; one degree, two majors. So one diploma, one degree posting on a transcript, but two majors. That can be done within 120 hours and only the primary program college requirements would be met. So you have a Liberal Arts primary program and a Science secondary program, the student would only complete College of Liberal Arts college requirements which are different that the College of Science.

T. Workman asked the Senate to consider whether the clarification to existing policy is needed or whether you want an additional policy. Look at whether or not you want the Double Major to continue or if you believe we should stay within the policies that we already have. You might also consider validating the practice with a policy entitled Double Major. An example of straight forward language would be "A student may earn a double major under the same degree with a minimum of 120 semester hours, providing the students fulfills the requirements specific to each major. Additional school or college and University Core Curriculum requirements must be met for the primary program only." This information is at the bottom of the page on the handout provided.

J. MacLean asked, in terms of reporting student success metrics, does the double Major count as two successes? Workman stated that only a degree counts in the metrics.

K. Chwalisz recognized Jennifer Smith, College of Education. Smith stated that she was there representing Colleges that have been doing the Double Major practice for a long time and wants to stress the importance of the Double Major in maintaining interdisciplinary programs. Smith provided a handout to those present. ([Attachment D](#)) Smith stated that a good example of the Double Major is the International Studies program. Students in that program must specialize in a specific geographical region and obtain a certain level of proficiency in one of the languages we offer that is spoken in the region in which they specialize. Many of the students decide to double major in International Studies and a language because picking up a second major in the language only requires six more classes

(18 hours). This is why we put a lot of time and effort in maintaining International Studies because they work together. If we were to get rid of the Double Major, our programs would compete against each other. The student would have to decide if they want to major in International Studies or major in Spanish. This causes a disincentive to support this interdisciplinary program. Smith stated that she wanted everyone to be aware of this particular case and added that she feels it is relevant to everyone across campus. Smith drew attention to the examples of other colleges regarding restrictions on double dipping as noted on Attachment D.

K. Chwalisz opened the floor for discussion.

J. Mathias noted that he has had so many people think that double major means dual degree. It is confusing. Other Universities definition of double major is what we call a dual degree.

C. Kingcade asked what problems is this causing and why do we have to change it.

Provost Chevalier responded by saying that this is not in our catalog so we have not been doing things according to the language of our contract with the students. We are not opposed to the practice. We are concerned that if there were an audit or accreditation, we would be awarding degrees that don't exist in our catalog. So we are trying to correct that. We really want our students to have unique ways of presenting themselves to employers, and a double major is a way of doing that. We want to support the practice. We want to make it legitimate.

T. Workman stated that we are actually posting double major awards on a transcript for which we don't have policy to support. The registrar's office really has no opinion about this other than to bring it to the Senate's attention that we need to be explicit with that which we are authorizing so that we can come to a common understanding across campus.

T. Grant asked if the language at the bottom of Attachment C would put in to writing the current practice and what kind of deadline are we looking at.

T. Workman responded by saying yes, that language is what the current practice is and added that if we were going to change the 2018-19 catalog, the implementation would be for graduates of summer 2018 forward. We do have some students who find themselves coded in error now. In this alignment we would have to mitigate that issue. We are working with Dr. Chevalier to mitigate that issue.

T. Grant stated that what he is asking is does this have to be decided today or would sometime during the spring be acceptable.

T. Workman stated that a decision would not have to be today, but would definitely have to be early spring so we can get language in the catalog before we go to print. Workman added that her preference and comfort zone would be for a decision to be made today unless there are a lot of questions. We need to have catalog published for advisement the first of February.

K. Chwalisz pointed out that the Senate does not meet in January, so a decision needs to be made today.

Provost Chevalier pointed out that we use the word publish because that is a term we are used to saying. We are not going to be publishing the catalog. February is when advisement starts to sit down with our current students and new students and say this is what is going to be offered. There is a legal point where that catalog becomes a document and we are trying to do that earlier. We used to do that in March.

J. Wall stated that he just wants to get a sense of understanding in terms of the reporting of the second major. Does only the first unit get credit for the major?

Provost Chevalier replied by saying that in terms of getting credit, that is how it is listed first. In terms of how we go about as an institution and look to see what these are, that's something that would still be available. We have a list of everyone's major and second major, so we were speaking more of an admissions talk rather than saying we have a practice.

J. Wall said his only concern was that he sees that charts and graphs on the wall that say you only have X amount of students, but the reality is there is much more.

T. Workman stated that enrollment number will be with the initial program.

Provost Chevalier added that institutional data is something that we can all access and get information from. The idea is to have students as well as faculty reach across these disciplinary boundaries.

K. Zivkovich stated that giving our students the option of whether it is a double major or a dual degree is in our best interest. Yes, everybody is concerned about who is getting credit within their departments, schools, colleges, or whatever, perhaps that shouldn't become so complicated, but yet, we still need to clarify it. I think to bring it back to the UEPC, we would just be rehashing the same thing. I think we need to move on this. We have the information we need.

Provost Chevalier stated that we need to fix this now. It's not the Senate's problem that it happened like this, but it is a reality.

M. Hoane stated that coming from Psychology this is an important issue at all times. One of the biggest surges we see in majors are pre-med students coming over and taking part in our curriculum in order to train better medical students. We love having other majors within our department. I think it makes us better and as we move forward, we would like to enhance that. I'm interested in moving forward with this and making it easier for our students.

Chancellor Montemagno asked if anyone finds it an inconsistency that it takes 120 credit hours to achieve a single major, and you can also have two majors for 120 credit hours. I find that there is a significant inconsistency. Implicit in that is that we should be able to give a major out for less than 120 credit hours. Montemagno added that he does not have the answer to this, but when I look at this, the requirements aren't really being elevated for achieving two majors. I can understand it with minors, but I don't understand why we have the same credit requirements for one major or two majors.

K. Chwalisz stated that it's only the best and brightest that manage to pull this off in 120 hours.

T. Grant stated that one of the issues he has a question about is it was said that colleges are split in how they interpret the language regarding requirements. So would using the working suggested on the handout work with one half of the colleges and not the other half?

T. Workman replied by saying that she chose to go with that language because the biggest colleges like Liberal Arts and Mass Communications are probably the biggest ones who engage in this and this is their understanding. If the Senate is not in favor of this language, then it can be changed, but we do need your guidance on you feel about 120 as well as you feel about the primary college requirement driving the situation.

T. Grant asked if it would be fair to say the argument from the other colleges would be to think that to get a degree in their college you need to have certain requirements. So when you have a degree program you are assuming that those college requirements are met, but now if they took a primary major in another college, they are not under the same requirements as other majors.

T. Workman responded by saying as the Registrar, I am the executor of your policy. If the college's assignments indicate a degree requirement that also includes the college of Science requirements, in my opinion, it is my role and responsibility to see that those requirements are met regardless of whether the student is completing what we call a Double Major or a Dual Degree. Workman added that she gets a lot of pushback from advisement on this issue. I need the Senate to tell me what they want.

T. Grant replied by saying let's say you did that and then took paralegal studies or something else. Under this policy, paralegal studies is the primary major of the student and would not be required to take the College of Science requirements. If the College of Science were the primary major, then the student would have to take additional courses.

T. Workman replied yes, that is correct.

J. Wall asked if there are any current requirements for the student to go through an approval process to get the double major.

T. Workman replied yes.

N. Martin asked how many students accomplish this in 120 hours.

T. Workman replied that she has only had time to look at last spring; 32 students had at least 120 hours and were awarded with double majors.

J. MacLean stated, now that the Faculty Senate is aware that this policy doesn't actually exist, if until we take action, does that mean that there is no creative accounting for students that think they are getting dual major by the old way. Are all the dual major students in limbo until there is a policy?

L. Chevalier replied no, we are not going to do that.

W. Metz stated that he sees no reason not to have the wording of the last paragraph provided on the handout changed from 120 semester hours to 150 semester hours. Metz added that he sees no reason, if a student is declaring a major, that they should not have to fulfil the requirements of both colleges. What damage does that do to be for rigorous?

J. Smith replied by saying none of our peers are doing it. Students would go to another university.

K. Chwalisz pointed out that it is also a matter of cost for students; 30 more credit hours is another year of school; \$25,000 or more.

W. Metz replied by saying that if they don't want that, they don't have to do that.

K. Chwalisz asked what if they want it and they can't afford it?

G. Miller asked if licensure would trump this policy.

T. Workman replied yes.

K. Zivkovich asked how many hours it takes to get the licensure.

G. Miller responded by saying it would be another semester at least.

K. Zivkovich noted that maybe that is why the University of Illinois has a minimum of 12 hours.

S. Lewison proposed that the Senate move forward with the suggested wording on the handout and suggested to add that they must in some way show that they are doing unique work in that double major; not to make it onerous or make it more economically stressful.

T. Grant stated point of order and noted that the motion would have to be under new business.

K. Chwalisz asked if there were any further comments and stated that the Senate will take action on this under new business.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Ahmad Fakhoury read the final slate of Judicial Review Board candidates for approval by written ballot. ([Attachment D](#)) A. Ortiz and G. Miller distributed and collected paper ballots. K. Chwalisz read the results of the ballots. Jason Bond, 29 approved, 1 did not approve. Bill Drennan, 30 approved. Daotai Nie, 20 approved, 1 did not approve. Mary Taylor, 29 approved, 1 did not approve. Walter Metz, 30 approved.

A. Fakhoury read the Motions to Approve the Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair to the Judicial Review Board. ([Attachment E](#)) Seconded by J. Bond. Motions to appoint Wanki Moon as chair and Joseph Brown as vice chair of the 2017-18 Judicial Review Board passed unanimously by voice vote.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLCY COMMITTEE –Sandra Collins, Chair read the following resolutions:

Resolution to Recommend Approval of Abolishing the Dietetics/Pre-Nursing Specialization in Human Nutrition and Dietetics ([Attachment F](#)) Resolution passed by voice vote with one opposed and no abstentions.

Resolution to Recommend Approval of Proposed Program Reviewers for the Center for Advanced Coal and Energy Research ([Attachment G](#)) Resolution passed by voice vote with one opposed and no abstentions.

Resolution to Recommend Approval of Proposed Program Reviewers for the Center for Fisheries, Aquaculture, and Aquatic Sciences ([Attachment H](#)) Resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.

Resolution to Recommend the Proposed Program Reviewers for the Fermentation Institute ([Attachment I](#)) Resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.

K. Chwalisz noted that the STEM Resolution was not sent to the full Senate within the five day window and called for a motion to include this resolution on the agenda. T. Grant made a motion to include the STEM resolution on the agenda. Seconded by g. Miller. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote. S. Collings read the resolution.

Resolution to Recommend Approval of Proposed Program Reviewers for the STEM Education Research Center ([Attachment J](#)) Resolution passed by voice vote with one abstention.

S. Collins said thank you to the most awesome UEPC ever.

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEE – Bobbi Knapp / Marissa Ellermann, Co-Chairs No report

BUDGET COMMITTEE – Derek Fisher, Chair K. Chwalisz reported for the committee and noted that traditionally there has been a Chancellor’s Budget Advisory Committee; that committee has not been active; it has been brought to the attention of the administration.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – Jim MacLean, Chair K. Chwalisz reported for the committee and stated that the Senate is still looking for a person to serve as parliamentarian during the meetings. Executive Council has asked the governance committee to work on developing best practice language related to the development of operating papers for the schools.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – Cherie Watson, Chair K. Chwalisz reported for the committee and noted that the committee will be working on adding to the UEPC to help with all of the upcoming program change proposals.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

K. Chwalisz opened the floor for discussion regarding the double major policy.

S. Lewison made a motion to adopt a policy that is similar to University of Illinois by using the suggestion provided in the handout (Attachment C) and adding a 12 hour requirement of specific classes. Seconded by C. Kingcade.

T. Workman asked if a student is required to complete a major requirement, how is that different from completing 12 distinct hours?

M. Odom responded by saying that the 12 hours could not be double dipped. It would be 12 distinct hours that are not in the other major.

T. Workman stated another concern is adding the 12 distinct hours is adding a level of complexity for compliance. Do we really want to do that to students?

T. Grant asked if we can just get something on the books now and if it is a problem, we can go back and fix it.

S. Lewison withdrew her motion. C. Kingcade agreed.

G. Miller made a motion to vote on the language as stated on the handout because it is in addition to the second bachelor’s degree and dual degree program. We can make changes later.

S. Ettema commented that she graduated from University of Illinois. Some of the students that have done double majors have fulfilled our requirements, but are also required to do a special project or independent study. We could think about doing the extra hours and an extra project or independent study.

A comment was made in regards to the time constraints and suggested that we codify what has been done for the past 20 years.

K. Chwalisz noted that there is a motion on the floor to vote on the language as stated on the handout. Seconded by S. Collins.

Chancellor Montemagno stated that he feels that this does not solve the underlying challenge. You can't have a dual degree major if the requirements change depending upon which major you decide is your primary major. There is a fundamental problem.

A comment was made that during the last half hour people have substituted dual major and double major which leads to believe that the requirements for the dual degree should be the same for the double major.

It was pointed out that there are also double majors at the graduate level.

K. Chwalisz stated that this is obviously an area that need our attention, but what we have been asked to do is deal with now is to recognize a procedure that has been in place for a number of years. Chwalisz added that there is a motion on the floor.

G. Miller restated the motion to vote on the language as stated on the handout ([Attachment C](#)) because it is in addition to the second bachelor's degree and dual degree program and added that changes can be made later. Seconded by S. Collins. Motion carried with 15 approved, 3 opposed, and 8 abstentions.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

No Faculty Senate meeting in January. The next Senate meeting is February 13, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
Grant Miller, Secretary
GM: ao