

Chancellor Montemagno has published a [blog post](#) arguing that the [FA's recent press release](#) has done a disservice to all who care about SIUC by "misrepresenting information." The information in our press release is accurate, and we reject the idea that sharing the results of faculty votes does a disservice to SIUC.

The chancellor argues that the 295 faculty votes to slow down the process (as opposed to 90 to speed it up) don't tell us anything about faculty views. But the chancellor himself has selectively cited similar votes on process when they have appeared to support him. And the chancellor urged faculty to speed up the process. Votes to slow the process down certainly oppose the chancellor in that regard.

The chancellor suggests that straw polls serve only to allow faculty to negotiate with one another. But the 111 faculty who voted to oppose the chancellor's plan in their area (as opposed to the 30 who voted in favor) were sending a message to the chancellor, whether he wants to hear it or not. The chancellor then contradicts himself by trying to find support in the "many" positive votes in straw polls. Apparently the votes of 79% of faculty who voted no are meaningless, while the 21% who voted yes count.

The chancellor stands by his claim that feedback on his plan has been positive, but has yet to provide any evidence to support that assessment. His claim is contradicted by public votes by the FS, GC, GSPC, and USG, the CCC survey results, and now by the compilation of votes in our press release. Apparently only positive, private input sent directly to the chancellor counts; public votes by faculty and students do not count—unless they are cast in favor of the chancellor's plan.

Some faculty do support the chancellor: we recognize as much, and we include their votes in our tallies. It is not surprising, however, that the one positive final vote on a school has come in an area where the chancellor agreed to promote a current department to a school, thereby retaining its autonomy as a unit while other departments were being merged.

The chancellor implies that the CCC survey was "distributed selectively," but bases his claim solely on vague, anonymous "comments of a number of individuals, including faculty." The CCC group publicized its survey via press coverage and Facebook advertising directed at all Facebook users in the Carbondale region. The survey was open to anyone with an internet connection. The group has been transparent [about its methods and results](#).

Our press release notes that there is no correlation between school structures and increases in enrollment. The chancellor does not dispute that overall enrollment in SIUC units currently structured as schools has gone down, but responds that enrollment in schools "in high demand fields" has gone up. The chancellor's own language reveals that it is demand in the field, not the academic structure, that has produced such growth: the school model is no better at growing enrollment than it is at losing enrollment.

We once again hear about "administrative efficiencies" in the chancellor's blog post, but he provides no details. And the chancellor's previous claims for savings from his restructuring plan [have been shown to be false](#).

The chancellor blames the delay in finalizing plans on faculty taking time to review and respond to proposals. But the contractual discussion period for most proposed schools ended on February 13; that for most others schools ended on March 13. Yet of the twenty proposed schools, only three have been presented to faculty for final review. Faculty have not been sitting on these plans for the

last six weeks: they have been stuck in Anthony Hall because the chancellor has tried to force through more changes than his own staff can process, and because [he shifted to proposing college RME's](#), a process which has also now been indefinitely extended.

The chancellor argues that it is “highly inaccurate” to say that there will be no structural changes on campus until July 1, 2019. But major changes to university structures and programs are only practicable when the “catalog year” begins, on July 1, and the chancellor will miss that deadline this year. If the chancellor really intends to merge departments or make other major changes in the midst of an academic year, between July 2018 and July 2019, that is a recipe for chaos.

It is certainly true that the chancellor has made many changes to his plan, but he has not been open to compromise about the fundamental element in his proposal, the decision to eliminate all academic departments and department chairs and replace them with schools and appointed directors.

Finally, the chancellor attacks the FA for not making positive suggestions. The FA is not a shadow government whose role is to suggest policy options (we are not administrators or administrators in waiting, and we are not the Faculty Senate), but we have [outlined the questions SIUC needs to answer](#) in order to intelligently address our enrollment crisis. Faculty across campus, moreover, are working on alternative ideas for restructuring at the college level (including in media and the arts, and in social sciences and humanities) and school levels (including in engineering and math), and have also [drafted proposals](#) for increasing enrollment by reducing tuition and fees or improving our retention programs.