

2017-2018 Faculty Senate Executive Council
Working meeting with Chancellor Montemagno
November 7, 2017

At its meeting on October 17, the Faculty Senate agreed that having a one-on-one meeting with the Chancellor to discuss the proposed reorganization would be very beneficial. It was difficult to find an available time for a special meeting with the Chancellor, so it was determined that the remaining Faculty Senate members would be invited to join the Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting on 11/7/17, which is already routinely attended by the Chancellor and Provost. Prior to this meeting, Faculty Senate members were asked to submit questions for this working meeting, via an online survey, and the questions were organized by themes and then sent to the Chancellor on 11/2/17.

The Executive Council met privately for the first hour of their meeting to discuss regular EC business, before the inclusion of invited guests (Chancellor, Provost, Senators)—as is typical of EC meetings. The EC also discussed a plan for the working portion of the meeting and identified three themes related to the reorganization process that they hoped this meeting would be focused on: 1) What are the specific challenges, problems, and issues that are being addressed/how are they being addressed by the specific aspects of the proposed reorganization? 2) What is the role of the reorganization in the overall mission/how is the construction of the mission going with regards to the survey data that was provided at the beginning of the year? 3) Where are we now in regard to this process?

Kathie Chwalisz, Faculty Senate President, began the working meeting portion of the EC meeting by welcoming attendees and discussing procedures. It was stated that the Chancellor will first answer the questions that were previously submitted, and there should be time to answer questions from the group after that. Chwalisz asked those present to think “big picture,” rather than focusing on questions affecting just their own units, and make this the most productive meeting possible. She noted that the Chancellor is going to be out of town for the regular Senate meeting on November 14, so this is an opportunity to get as much done as we can. The planned questions and themes were presented, and she asked the Senators for other topics/themes, to which there was no response.

Chancellor Montemagno started by talking about the “process that we are engaging in.” “This is probably the most fundamental way of shared governance that you will see in your entire careers. What we are trying to do is put together a framework that enables the faculty to redesign and re-envision the institution. We are trying to remove shackles of bureaucracy and shackles of contractual limitations, so that we have the operating freedom for the faculty to do everything that they want to do move this institution forward. So, this process is one of discussion and assessment that we’re going through. I can tell you that there have been over 500 communications, representing 750 or so people, with thoughtful ideas that range from how the schools should be reorganized to questions about individual programming.” A significant number of faculty (approx. 300-400) have participated in these discussions. Chancellor Montemagno stated that he has “read every single one of the responses. The plan, as it is moving forward, has morphed significantly based upon the input that has been received.” He is meeting with groups of faculty to discuss their ideas.

The Chancellor continued, “This is an interesting process we are going through. Once the schools are identified and the programs that would be in the schools, at that point, it is the faculty now that have to decide what the culture is of that school, what programs they want to emphasize, what programs they want to keep, what programs they want to merge, what programs they want to eliminate, and what new programs they want to create. It’s all up to the faculty...nature of the schools defined by the faculty. This is all about the faculty taking ownership of what your intellectual home is going to look like and where it positions yourself for the future.” “There is going to be differences of ideas and opinions and ultimately you are going to have to come to some consensus about what your community is going to be like. So, it’s exciting, and you will all be able to say later on in your career you are going to be able to say you helped define SIU by your activities and your actions. It’s going to be a lot of work, because we have to do all of this while maintaining the programs that we have, while going through a transition period.”

Next, the Chancellor started to address the questions that had been submitted to him prior to the meeting.

Questions about Departments and Programs:

1) How can a program proposed to move to another college be guaranteed the retain control of their curriculum? Curriculum may belong to the faculty but workload assignments belong to the Director. All the new college would have to do is start strategically moving controllable faculty into that program so the majority vote would then correlate with what the new college wanted.

CM: "The faculty of the school are going to own their curriculum; they are going to decide where these programs are going, what the requirements are, how it's going to be taught; it's all controlled by the faculty. There is going to be no centralized control over this, like it never was. A University is defined by its faculty and staff, not by the buildings...; the faculty will determine what their academic programs are and what the requirements are and control that program based upon the rules of shared governance that you establish among yourselves with individual schools."

2) How centralized are currently-departmental resources going to be within schools? Can there still be "someone" (in the "division" who is a fiscal officer on local accounts currently associated with departments (e.g. foundation, cost recovery, fees, etc.)

CM: "The idea about resources is not going to be different than what you have right now, where resources get distributed to deans, and deans distribute them to departments. The resources get distributed to a dean, and they'll distribute them to school directors, the school directors will decide how, with the programs, the money will be allocated in concert with their faculty."

3) Who makes the standards for student recruitment? Individual programs or Schools?

CM: "Those are all defined by your academic programs. Your program should define what the basic skills you want your students to have, what courses they should have taken, what their performance on standardized tests should be, what their GPA should be. You need to be focused on defining what are the students we are striving for and what we want to recruit. It's a faculty led determination."

4) Questions about Department Chairs (answered as a topic and not individual questions)

CM: "What you are going to find is that program directors, the unit head (or whatever the final name of that position will be) is going to be a faculty member who does not need to be an administrator. Currently department chairs are administrators. I view this person who takes on that role as a faculty member who does it as a service for their program. This person will do this for two or three years; the duties will get divided up among the faculty; the faculty will own and control the program. The biggest pushback has been from department chairs because they feel they are losing their jobs, and in many respects, they are losing their jobs and their authority, but they are going back to the faculty and will function as faculty members. It has been said that the \$2.3 million saved is miniscule compared to the importance. Let me put this to context, it costs \$1.1 million to give you a 1% raise; the \$2.3 million corresponds to a 2% raise. When was the last time faculty received a raise? The fact of the matter is that it's not miniscule in the context of the discretionary money that we have in our budget. It's a significant amount of resources...It's being said that the \$2.3 million doesn't make a big difference. It's a lot of money compared to the actual amount of discretionary money we have to do things with."

5) Questions about faculty workload under reorganization (answered as a topic and not individual questions)

CM: "This again, will be defined by the faculty. The faculty are going to define what the workload policy will be. I'm hoping that you put together operating papers that will take into account faculty's interests and desires that change during the progression of their career; that in some parts of your career you may want to be heavily engaged in research so the administrative work load is very low; other parts of your career you may want to be fully engaged in teaching; other parts you may want to be engaged in service and support and representing the organization. Hopefully you will have fluidity in how you design the governance of your units that you enable that and take it in to account; that you operate as a community." Chancellor Montemagno provided an example from a faculty planning meeting for the next

year, at a previous institution; where a faculty member announced that he would be going sabbatical and asked if someone else could take his course, and someone volunteered pick up the course; someone else would announce that they will have two less graduate students and offered to take on more if someone else needed him to; it was a community effort. "At a different university, the faculty would argue about how many courses they had to teach and behaved like they were working at a factory and didn't want to put any more than five lug bolts on a wheel, because that is what the rules said they had to do." Montemagno stated that he wanted this university to be like the first example; "where we are a community, we own our academic programs, and we have a vested interest in the success of our academic programs. I hope that when you put together your ideas of how you are going to work together, you put flexibility in those guidelines, so you operate and function like a community. And that you are all pulling together, because a central theme is that you want to ensure the success of your students and the success of each individual faculty member in their career. I know this is a culture shift. This is not the way we have worked and operated. We have a chance where we are defining what we are doing to move ourselves that way." "When people talk about how shared governance works, that is the way it is. It's like at Cornell, being a department chair, it was a service; it is not considered a career stepping stone; it was somebody who volunteered to do it for five years. It wasn't something that you did for 25 years and defined yourself as a department chair; it was something that you did in service to your faculty members; they weren't administrators; they were a voice that represented their faculty. It's a different slant. You can have it that they are there as an administrator, to impose the will of the administration on faculty, or you can have it so that they are the voice of our community, that ensures our community is working together. I think the other is more healthy and provides a community for us to work and want to live."

6) The term "management" does not justify moving all management related degrees should just merge into the Business school. If curriculum belongs to the faculty then if faculty say their classes are specific to their field, why isn't their expertise honored in that case scenario. Have you sat in one of the Business class! Can you honestly say that one of their classes will sufficiently cover every specialized program you gave to Business? And if it did, what value is it for a student in sports management to sit and waste their money learning about banking or investments rather than something specific to their field? One size does not fit all!

CM: You are absolutely correct. Based on feedback and input from faculty members, the sports management program is not going to go in to Business anymore; the program is focused on using sports as a rehabilitation tool and not as a management tool; it will probably have to be renamed because it doesn't reflect what they do. *This questions was clarified later in the meeting; Recreation Professions will be moved out of Management. Chancellor Montemagno apologized for referring to the wrong program.*

7) Questions about Graduate Students and GA Funding (answered as a topic and not individual questions)

CM: "The institution gets money for GA's, except for a small amount of money that is going to be reallocated to help support the courses that aren't going to be taught by GA's who are Instructor of Record. The money is essentially staying; it has gone out to all of the deans with the assumption that we are going to get the same money as we did last year from the State. The growth is going to have to come through two sources of revenue; one source is through grants and contracts; the other is from endowments. I am pursuing both. The plan is to at least double the research enterprise we have here on campus, which means that we will double the amount of graduate students. The State money pot is not going to increase, so growth is going to come in departments which are more effective at raising money through grants, and it's going to grow by donors who want to give money to invest in GA's in other areas."

8) From the proposed reorganization plan it appears most of the attempts at cost cutting are at the lower levels. What reorganization plans are in the works for upper administration (above the dean level) to help move the university forward?

CM: "What can be said is that in the budget cuts that came through, the Provost took the biggest cut, \$1.8 million, far larger than any other place on campus. Cuts were made while still providing as much support as possible and that is recognized.

9) What is your plan for all the diversity and inclusion interdisciplinary programs such as Latino/Latin American Studies, Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Native American Studies, etc?

Chancellor Montemagno stated that he has had dialog with Africana Studies and a number of other groups and looked at how we want to have this impact our core curriculum so that we graduate students who are culturally competent. “The end result is that we are going to create a school that is called something like the School of Social Science and Multicultural Studies; these programs are going to be moved into that school. The focus of that school is to elevate the stature of those programs and to work in a concerted way of how we incorporate that in to the academic programming across campus. How that is going to be included in the academic programming is something that the faculty are going to have to work on and decide.”

Questions from Those Present

A Senator commented about ideas about department chairs have been characterized as fearful about losing their jobs. He stated that he could get behind most of the plan, but “I think that element of it will be destabilizing and demoralizing, and disruptive--and not in a creative disruptive way. The question is if faculty in a particular part of the university would prefer to keep the departmental structure, while proposing other ways to meet our common goals, would you be open to this? If so, how should faculty work on such a proposal?”

CM: “Departments have a very special connotation in the policy and in contractual agreements with the FA, in that the requirement for me to eliminate departments speaks to how do I create schools to organize themselves to take advantage of their structures. The ability to move back to and have something called departments is something that can happen later on after we work out the contractual and policy issues that I have no control over; that have to be dealt with through collective bargaining. So, the issue is not that I’m against departments. The issue is that there are organizational challenges and limitations that come as a result of having something that is called a department; because of the policies and contractual nature of our relationships with the FA. When I eliminate that, I can free ourselves up from that, and I will allow the faculty to reorganize themselves and establish operating papers for them to work. In the future, after we get those issues resolved, I am more than happy to entertain having the units be re-described, be described as departments. It’s just something that, in order to make these changes happen, I can’t do right now.”

[Follow-up question from same Senator] What are the contractual issues that necessitate that reorganization requires the elimination of departments?

Dave Dilalla, APAA, responded by saying that “if we were to back up and attempt to reinstate a department structure as part of the current proposal, the name ‘department’ is defined in certain ways in University policy and in the CBA; to the extent that we are looking to decrease the number of administrative positions, we couldn’t for example have a department without a department chair, we couldn’t for example have a department without a departmental operating paper, so we find ourselves in a position where you have dueling operating papers for the same level of administration—chair and director as parallel levels, department and school as parallel levels. It’s not a requirement in any way, it’s just an observation about the fact that the term “department” has a meaning in the contract and it has a meaning in policy.”

DiLalla continued, “What’s being suggested is that if you look five years down the road and there is some possibility for calling a unit a department rather than a division, but that unit doesn’t have a department chair, then we can envision that kind of scenario. But under the current structure, if we’re looking to condense the number of lower level administrators, we would not be able to do that with a department structure.”

[Another Senator had questions about what things would be like without department chairs.] What is the vision for the faculty member that will volunteer to be “chair” in terms of compensation? Without a “chair,” who will do the administrative work? How will this person have time to do more research and grants when they have to do administrative work? [Gave examples of things chairs do like meeting with families.]

Chancellor Montemagno replied by saying that the “hope is that, through the reorganization, we will be freeing up administrators that will be reassigned and pick up some of the workload that faculty are exercising right now. The idea is if we have schools, you can have someone managing the reimbursements for travel, speakers, etc., whereas before you might not have had that person.” “The other thing involves the distribution of labor and other types of activities that the department chair does. I’ve been a department chair, and I know what a department chair does. There are many tasks that a department chair does, that could easily be done by the school director or their staff. Then for the advocacy elements associated with a particular program, and being the representative for that program, that’s what can be done at the programmatic level. I think we are going to find that the answer is different, of how this all transpires, depending on the size of the program, the size of the school, and where it is. That is part of what will happen towards the reforming of the schools is that there will be identification of where activities that were embedded in each individual program can be shared across the school and which activities need to stay in individual departments.”

Where do you envision the School Directors coming from?

Chancellor Montemagno replied by saying initially they will be interim from within, but then we will follow the common process for doing competitive searches.

Dave Dilalla added that there are examples of this working on campus right now; “the School of Allied Health, School of Architecture, School of Music, and the School of Art and Design all have multiple degree programs overseen by a single school director. These programs are not small programs. We also have examples of departments that, clearly when looking at their names, are combinations of departments that used to be stand alone (e.g., Health Education and Recreation; Animal Science, Food, and Nutrition), and I suspect that when those merged, we had similar questions.”

Lizette Chevalier, APAP, chimed in, “We’ve seen the budget cuts that have happened, and many departments missing staff; staff have not been replaced. We’re doing planning through attrition. And so, with the school concept, you can bring staff up where they are serving multiple different programs. I see that as a win-win situation. I’ve seen some departments that have two or three staff and others have one, and they are equal in the number of faculty they are serving. And so, this is a response to that also—which is why you [faculty] are doing the travel.”

Do you think that top performing faculty, who have aspired to be a chair, will go to a more traditional program where that is a more prestigious jump for them, rather than staying in house? Our [med school] chairs are our greatest examples of doing what faculty should be doing, and we want them to lead by example.

CM: “I think that may happen, but of course you could say that they would aspire to be a school director, which would be even presumably more prestigious. And that would still be an interim step to being a dean. So, I don’t think that gets lost.”

The difference between chairs and division directors has already been brought up, can the papers be changed to allow you to use the name chairs?

Chancellor Montemagno stated that they are thinking about calling them division directors, because as previously discussed, we don’t have the operational freedom to call them chairs right now, because of contractual issues; it is an item that is open for discussion with the representing elements.

Dave Dilalla noted that there are multiple points where language exists (e.g., university policy, individual operating papers, CBA).

Kathie Chwalisz summarized that it sounds like a certain amount of deconstruction has to happen, before it can be reconstructed under the new system.

Is there any research university that has this structure?

Chancellor Montemagno replied, “Completely the way we are doing it right now, not that I know of.”

When someone asks what control we have over the programs that are going to be put in to place, from your answers, it sounds like when it goes to a school, those degree programs could be eliminated by the majority of the faculty in the new school.

CM: “I think that you are going to find that there is going to be a considerable amount of hopefully honest discussion among the faculty in the school and that they are going to have decide what’s essential and which programs are going to be stellar and world class, and which programs have synergy that can prosper from the result of merging of existing programs and curricula, and which new programs you have a desire to do.” [CM shared an example from a recent meeting with faculty.] “The dialog that the faculty need to do needs to go beyond program a, b, or c; to looking at the objectives of the programs and learning content of the programs; and is there a better way we can work together to make them all better. And there will be programs where the faculty might say that the objectives of that program are being satisfied by this program, and we should focus our resources of this program and free up resources to make that program better.”

What are your concerns about accreditation and having faculty who are not experts in a degree program? We hope that we will put people together and they will all get along...

Lizette Chevalier, APAP, responded by saying that is not going to be an issue.

What if you are moved to a school that says there are no rules other than majority rules?

Dave Dilalla responded by saying that the new schools will write their own operating papers; you can imagine a number of ways to write that operating paper to make it balanced for everyone (e.g., house of representative model vs. senate model).

Lizette Chevalier further noted that, “There is also an obligation of the school director and for the students enrolled in these programs to have the resources that these programs can be delivered. And when it comes to the accreditation of the institution as a whole, or the accreditation of programs that accrediting bodies that say ‘you need this,’ our idea is to protect these programs. And programs come and go, we are still going to have the same ebb and flow that we should be having right now; we see it all the time. And we should take care in consideration when looking at discontinuing a program with the same care and consideration we take when developing new programs. The school director that’s managing the resources and the faculty developing the operating paper need to be cognizant of all of the points you just brought up.”

Chancellor Montemagno noted that the biggest point is that “those decisions being made by the faculty who are most knowledgeable about the programs in that space. It’s not gonna be one of these things where I need to cut programs and I’m going to sit in my office and do some academic prioritization activity, and then by using metrics which maybe don’t indicate the value and contributions of that program, and I’m going to go say ‘I’m sorry we’re going to cut these programs.’ The programs need to be owned by the faculty; the faculty need to understand that they have to operate those programs within the constraints and resource and demand base for those faculty; also take into account the scholarly contribution that those programs give to the university as a whole. So, it may be that there are only a small number of students that take a particular program, but the intellectual contribution to why you want to have it as a comprehensive university is such that you want to preserve it. But these are decisions that should rest with the faculty and not rest in my office.” “If it’s the Senate’s wish that it should rest in my office, please let me know. [audience chuckles] I’m being honest, if you want me to make these decisions, I’ll make these decisions. In a true shared governance model, the faculty have the responsibility for managing and nurturing and deciding the direction of their academic programs, which means you make hard decisions during that process...It’s about how you make your academic programs and your offerings move forward, be current, and in demand—and have the diversity of program offerings that elevate the intellectual nature of the institution that we all believe in and love.”

CM continued, “Shared governance is hard, and when you are at an institution where you haven’t had shared governance in a really long time, your shared governance has been about demanding to have your voice heard.

[audience chuckles] But when you really get shared governance, there's a bit responsibility associated with it, and you have ownership responsibility for the programs and to make hard decisions. This is what I'm trying to give back to everyone, because I can tell you this unequivocally, **the stronger the shared governance, the greater the university**. I believe that in my heart, and I know that's absolutely true."

Kathie Chwalisz stated that it would be helpful to provide some training in different models of how to write an operating paper and what are the principles that we want to make sure to include. [Lizette Chevalier took notes on that point.]

Sandy Collins stated that there are examples on operating papers in the CBA.

Dave Dilalla stated that those are more of a roadmap; it's very basic. Dilalla added that he is very conscious about being perceived as presuming to impose an operating structure, but he agreed it is a great idea to seek out models.

Concerns were voiced about programs with lower numbers of faculty having equal representation or having the votes to do things within a school. Are there ways to address those concerns?

Chancellor Montemagno responded by saying there are definitely ways that his office can be engaged in the initial formative period of the schools, but if you want that to be done, the Senate should say so. Montemagno stated that if you want him to insert himself within that governance, give him the direction and he will "work as an honest shepherd to try and do that." The plan is for the faculty is to engage in the faculty process.

Dave Dilalla added that there are multiple layers of review that can be involved and can help, if it appears that a smaller program is being taken advantage of.

There has been talk about shared governance; the **part about departments and department chairs** is not sold yet; it seems like the only way the restructuring can work is if we break down the departments; if we are truly going to have shared governance, then the faculty have to be part of the conversation from the top; whether we need to take away departments and chairs and replace them with schools; that is the one big issue; it seems that **this is the part of the restructuring that is being imposed and that is where the challenge is.**

Chancellor Montemagno stated that "in an ideal world, that is something he would have loved to have engaged in a discussion. [provided some context for the group] **We don't have time as a community to discuss this for an entire year; we just don't, and I'm sorry. We need to get this moved forward so we can begin recruiting mid-winter for Fall 2019. I just don't have time to engage in this discussion. You are absolutely correct, given other circumstances, I would have put that [the department question] out as the initial part of the strawman. What I'm going to say is that you have to trust me. That's what you hired me to do. You're going to have to trust me on making this one piece of judgment on what we have to do to get ourselves right organized.** I know that this is making people uncomfortable, and I know that there are challenges associated with it, but I'm just laying out the real facts here. This is why we are engaged in this activity and this is why the pitch is so feverish."

What is the **Police Academy** and what is its role in an R1 research facility? What type of research happens there, and is this a negotiable point?

CM: "The police academy that we put forward is being promoted from a very unique and special viewpoint. The idea is to leverage our school that has social sciences and multicultural competency to provide support for the police academy so that we become the national nexus for educating peace officers who are fully knowledgeable about dealing with people of different backgrounds and different cultures, so that we can address some of the challenges and feelings that people have. The only way those things get dealt with is through education, and we have a strong multicultural program that can lend support for doing it. I want to have multi-week courses where police officers come from around the country, so we become the national nexus of developing peace officers for the next generation. And I think it fits in well with the support of the other issues associated with homeland security; that we end up having a cybersecurity program; we finally coalesce the forensic science programs so we provide a certificate program for those individuals; and we provide a pathway for our criminal justice majors, where the majority of our students have a desire to become peace

officers, and they have the opportunity while they are completing their degree...This provides a huge competitive advantage for recruiting students from around the country, and if we can educate them in a unique curriculum that emphasizes as part of its core multicultural competency, we end up producing peace officers that we want representing us on the street.”

How is the restructuring going to increase enrollment?

Chancellor Montemagno responded by saying that we will be **establishing a number of new programs within each one of the schools** and having the school structure **allows us to coordinate programs that show significant strength in individual, topical areas which from a student looking from the outside gets to see**; we will have **programs which transcend multiple boundaries that would normally be within departments**, this is the idea for attracting students. Things that are dispersed through the university don't look like much, because they are all separate apart. “A lot of this is going to rest upon the faculty in the schools, looking at their programs, how they can build on synergies, how can they position themselves for the future. **In the early part of the year, I'll have dialogues with the presumptive schools' faculty, and we'll talk about the ideas about how we can move forward.**” “The students are going to come only because of the programing we put in place. We have been unable because of the restrictive boundaries by the way we funded things and by the way compensation was being made to departments, that we haven't been able to do many of the things we wanted to do. This is going to free it up.” The success is going to rest entirely within the faculty.

An Engineering faculty member asked, how does this plan support the research mission and STEM given that all of engineering programs are collapsing in to one school?

Chancellor Montemagno responded by saying there is a significant amount of building that has to go on within the College of Engineering; there are very critical programs that are missing that are essential to be competitive on a national stage. First and foremost, there is not a chemical engineering program, and as far as I know there is not a top 150 ranked institution that does not have a chemical engineering program. He expressed that his understanding was that this has to do with the walls that we currently have. We need to rebuild the critical mass in engineering. The STEM disciplines are important and they need to be nurtured and moved forward, but it has to be done in a way that allows a concentration and focus of resources.

Chancellor Montemagno continued, “At the same time, we have challenges in the **fine arts**, where they can't get any graduate students for their programs. And I got the chance to talk to some of the faculty members there and they are worrying about shutting down some of their programs. I talked to some of the faculty in agriculture, and some of their core programs are decimated in terms of faculty. I have to fix all of this, and I have to start by slowing the bleeding on the students, getting the enrollment back up, and making strategic investments across the entire envelop of programs that we have. At the same time, what this reorganization does, it gives me wonderful marketing material that I can take to donors. Many of the donors have not given us any real resources, because they do not believe we are doing anything to make ourselves better...graduate assistantships for the arts...endowments for engineering faculty...Fourteen schools, gives me 14 naming opportunities.”

Grant Miller, Faculty Senate Secretary made a quick comment...one thing that's been really helpful is that we've talked a lot about the **solutions and problems that we are trying to address, and that there is a clear sense of what the challenges are that the solutions are addressing—not just solutions for solutions sake. A good example is the police academy, I just heard about the police academy, but seeing what problem or challenge that is nationally that we are trying to address is really helpful. And I have been in meetings with programs where we were trying to work together and it kind of went way, what we were trying to initiate, because of questions of who gets the credit.**

How is the process going forward with RME's? There may be competing RMEs, and I would fear it's a process of first-come first served. Where a competing RME comes a month later and it gets ignored, because something else is already in process. Is there a structure identified at this point, or where are we in that process?

Dave Dilalla responded by saying the Provost's office will be providing, when a program proposal emerges from the 90 or 120 period, and it becomes a program change plan, it will be accompanied by RME's that will come to the constituency bodies using our usual campus processes. That means a lot of them will come from the administration. The question is whether there could be other proposals that could come to the body as well; the answer is yes. That would be an issue for the Faculty Senate to resolve.

Kathie Chwalisz suggested that the Senate would have to work on their procedures, deadlines, etc.

RE: Graduate Student Teaching

One Senator talked about how in her department, a major recruiting tool for graduate students is that they can become Instructor of Record; these GA's are very closely supervised; there are areas that are struggling to teach classes, and without graduate students teaching we don't have the faculty to teach all of our classes: can you address that concern?

Chancellor Montemagno responded by saying that "the fact that you supervise your GA's means that they aren't an Instructor of Record; the Instructor of Record is actually a document that specifies the responsibilities of that person; because they are under supervision, they really aren't instructors of record. Maybe the issue is that we need to change what we are calling it or change the name, but the Instructor gets to decide who gets to take the class, the syllabus for the class, the textbook for the class, and the final grades for the class. They do all of these things independently. If you are supervising them, and you are mentoring them, they aren't really an Instructor of Record. The question is do we have to put in place a different sort of moniker or change that rule of what defines the Instructor of Record. We have a split between what we are calling something and what is meaningful."

[A senator made a comment about their own discipline, and that their proposed program/school structure was not on the cutting edge. It was determined that the department(s) in question hadn't submitted a related alternate proposal, and the senator was encouraged to have their department develop and submit a proposal—and a senator from a related department said their departments should have a conversation about this idea.] "So, what that implies is that these schools and divisions are are still up for discussion and negotiation."

CM: "Yes. You are going to see considerable changes in what the schools are when it gets released next week. We made significant changes. I looked at all this stuff and I made changes based on rational arguments. There are different schools, and some schools are in different colleges—yes! How many times have I had to say this—this is true shared governance. You give me input, I listen to it, I read it, I weight it, and I make a decision. So, yes."

There are concerns related to recruiting. Examples were offered of not receiving data regarding potential students; we are not doing recruiting calls any longer; not advertising on TV; a previous Chancellor spending over \$1 million to change our logo. What are the plans for strong recruitment?

Chancellor Montemagno noted that there are a lot of things that haven't been getting done that we are trying to get done. "I've only been here two and a half months." [audience chuckles] He responded by saying there are TV commercials out there right now. [It was suggested that the TV commercial be sent to everyone on campus so they can see it, if they haven't already.] TV commercials do not appear to have a great impact on recruitment. We are changing the way we are reaching out to students. The marketing materials are all going to be program based—targeted recruitment versus a comprehensive viewbook. We have extraordinary marketing talent on campus, and yet we haven't made good use of it in the past. There are a lot of things we can do better. There are a lot of things going on in the backrooms that could be done better—systems that are not fulfilling the goals and objectives that we want.

We have a national search on for an admissions director to deal with this. It has been done in an ad hoc and not very coherent way in the past.

[A senator made comments about the experience she has had with her college age children going through the process of college recruitment and how SIU's procedures compare to others she's seen—and the feelings it leaves. Another Senator made a comment about his nephew's experience.]

Chancellor Montemagno described some of the efforts he has made to address some of these types of things.

Comment about the Contract and Departments

Dave Dilalla clarified his earlier response regarding the contract and departments. It's an answer to a question that they have heard a lot—why can't there be departments within the schools--so maintain the name department, even if there isn't a chair, can we just maintain the name "department"; that is the question. What are we going to call the program. The answer is that is in part procedural with respect to the university and in part contractual, because the name department is defined. That is the only reason we are talking about the contract in this context, because it answers the question of why not call it a department and nest it underneath a school.

A Senator suggested that it would be helpful to see that language as a way of understanding it better—to be clear that it's not a union-busting thing.

Does tenure stay in the division/department or does it stay in the school?

Dave Dilalla replied it stays within the school. Tenure follows the faculty member to the school. With respect to our structure, departments and schools are parallel entities, administratively.

A questions from untenured colleagues is what about the requirements for tenure?

Dave Dilalla replied that that is going to be an issue for developing the operating papers. The tenure expectations can be situated in the programs/divisions, but it depends on how the operating papers are written. That will be an important part of how those documents are created.

Lizette Chevalier replied that current tenure track faculty will be held to the operating paper they were hired on; they can make the decision to be held to the new operating paper if they choose.

What is the role of the Senate with the RME's? How can we best facilitate this process?

Lizette Chevalier replied by saying the Senate will have to talk among itself about how to go about processing these types of things, so it can operate with some efficiency to get these things moved forward.

One Senator noted that SIU is more expensive than flagship universities in surrounding states.

Chancellor Montemagno responded by saying the majority of students don't choose where they are going to go based upon cost; they go based upon the opportunities the university provides them. The increase in Illinois college tuition is relative to the decline in State funds; we discount our tuition more by a significant factor than any other institution in Illinois. Montemagno added that he is increasing the amount of scholarship that comes in the form of housing while reducing the amount of tuition waiver; if you come and live on campus, you will get a discount of \$2,000. This is being done for three reasons: 1) because we have a campus that is dead after 5:00 p.m., we need a 24/7 campus that is alive and vibrant, we need to get students living here on campus; 2) we need to improve our sense of community by having students living on campus; 3) we increase the occupancy rate which makes it easier to justify building new housing.

What can faculty do through this reorganization process to increase positive response for HLC?

Chancellor Montemagno responded by saying that we need to take self-assessment very seriously; this is something that needs to be done to make sure we receive full accreditation on our next review; embrace the whole idea of continuous improvement.