WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Regular Meeting, *20 February 2018*, 4:00 p.m.
Capitol Rooms - University Union

A C T I O N M I N U T E S

SENATORS PRESENT: M. Allison, B. Bellott, V. Boynton, J. Franken, R. Hironimus-Wendt, A. Hyde (via teleconference), N. Lino, B. Locke, S. Macchi H. McIlvaine-Newsad, B. Perabo, J. Plos, R. Porter (via teleconference), S. Rahman, T. Roberts, S. Rock, S. Saddler, M. Sajewski, D. Sandage, C. Tarrant, F. Tasdan
Ex-officio: KK.dEt(i).05 T32(a63(.KTw [()Td3(.,)-2n(Ex)Tj 182(nt)-5(e)-2(r)-4ni)-5(m)]TJ9.9891 0 Td ( )Tj [P)-2(r)-4o(v)11

elko

ta Hardeman, Tammy Killian, Angela Lynn, Madison Lynn, Sue
o, Russ Morgan, Nancy Parsons, Rebecca Slater, Jenna

Consideration of Minutes

A. ,nWeeL-2(u30t89L-y(i)-1 3.261 0 Td [(R)6(eq)2(u)2(es)11(t)-3(s)11(f)-2(o)2(r)-2(N)7(ew)7(C)6(o)2(u)13

President Grant Reed submitted
on the request of Chairperson
sed language from the resolution
st all SGA Cabinet members as
olidarity was approved. The bill

passed unanimously

OMR is part of Ricoh's partnership with Gravic. She stated that besides faculty being able to change their answer sheets, Remark OMR will allow faculty to drill down into the data

Senator Franken asked if some questions can be worth two points and other questions worth four points. Mr. Joslin replied that this is possible; professors can set whatever point value they wish for individual questions during the template process or in the advanced answer key window. Ms. Wilkerson added that professors can set up questions where students must write a short sentence for the answer or draw a graph, which would be something that professors would manually grade and assign a point value to the response. The Remark OMR system would save the image of the written response or graph.

Parliamentarian Kaul asked where the data resides – whether it resides only on the server or on the individual machines – and who owns the data. Ms. Wilkerson responded that this depends on what version the customer purchases; the cloud version stores data in the cloud, but if software licenses are purchased the data would reside on the individual PCs. Mr. Joslin added that the demo he showed senators is desktop-based, and data would be stored locally.

Senator Perabo asked if the Scantron sheets can be printed on any machine using the Remark OMR system. Ms. Slater responded that the sheets can be printed on any machine, but scanning must be done on Ricoh multi-function printers, and WIU is not fully Ricoh. She pointed out that cost will have to be part of this conversation; the cloud version would be twice what WIU currently spends on Scantron forms and maintenance on the machine. She thinks what makes more sense for WIU is to have the systems set up in a few selected locations, such as deans' offices or other central locations. Senator Perabo asked if the intention is to have a long-term contract with Ricoh, but Ms. Slater responded that if the University decided to replace Ricoh copier with Canon, the Remark OMR system would work on those as well or any other multi-function copier. She told senators that the University spends about $10,000 per year on Scantron forms; not having to purchase these forms would offset the cost of placing the Remark OMR system on a selected few desktops, taking into account that this would also have to take into account the cost of printing. University Technology has worked with Dr. Runquist to duplicate the current Scantron forms so that faculty can keep using that format with the Remark OMR system if they choose.

Senator Allison remarked that the Department of English uses Scantrons infrequently. She asked who currently pays for the Scantron sheets. She wonders if the change will just mean shifting the cost of printing to the departments. Ms. Slater responded that this is currently paid by University Technology, and she does not anticipate that will change, but departments would be printing more paper so there would likely be some cost differential to be shifted. Senator Allison remarked that her department limits how much individual faculty members can print. Ms. Slater offered to provide information regarding how many Scantron sheets are scanned by departments across the University and a cost per page, although she admitted that toner and paper costs might increase for departments in future. She added that University Technology would still print out the evaluation piece for faculty, and that is the majority of the Scantron usage. Senator Allison asked if the Scantron evaluations would continue after the new system is adopted; Ms. Slater replied that the idea at this time is that they would continue to be printed in uTech, who would also scan them if desired by faculty.

Senator Allison asked if she would be expected to walk to the dean's office to do the scanning because for English faculty in Simpkins Hall that is a trip to the other end of campus. Ms. Slater replied that a machine would probably also be set up in Stipes Hall 126, where the current Scantron machine is located, but it was thought that other locations could be available around the campus so that faculty do not have to go to Stipes.

Senator Hironimus-Wendt asked if it is fair to assume that the cost to faculty would be that of adding one extra page – the score sheet – to each test. Ms. Slater explained that the difference in cost is because the University pays a significant amount yearly for Scantrons

things like designing quick, simply surveys to send to alumni or investors, for example. He thinks this could have a lot of benefits in terms of maintaining contacts with alumni.

Interim Provost Neumann stressed that Scantrons are the only acceptable method for course evaluations, and that is an important point. Senator Allison asked if the Remark system is chosen if the switch would be only for exams and not for student evaluations. Ms. Slater responded that the change would apply to both. She noted that the change would not require a heavy upfront investment, unlike most other technology, and can be switched over for the cost that is currently being paid on equipment the University already owns. She added that if WIU decided three years from now to pursue a completely electronic system and do away with Scantrons, faculty could just stop using them, and University Technology would not have invested in any infrastructure.

Parliamentarian Kaul asked what the final recommendation is from CIT. Dr. Ehrlich responded that CIT's final recommendation is to choose the Remark OMR system because it provides the same capabilities as Scantron but also has additional capabilities. He stated that it can be distributed across the campus so that it is more accessible to faculty members, and CIT thinks it provides a really good approach to test scoring.

College of Arts and Sciences Dean Sue Martinelli-Fernandez stated that if the Dean's

that the “do nothing” approach (waiting until the machine breaks for good) is one potential model that can be considered if the University is willing to take on that potential risk, but the machine could break during finals and not be able to be fixed for some period of time. She stated University Technology wanted to bring the potential risk before Faculty Senate now while something can still be done to mitigate it.

Senator Tarrant asked if there is a side-by-side comparison of the Remark system with the current Scantron machine. Ms. Slater responded the annual costs are the same, there is no initial outlay, and the licenses are equal to the amount spent yearly on Scantron sheets and annual maintenance of the current machine. She added that there is no initial cost because the Remark system will work on any printer or computer at the University; there is a software license cost that would be offset by no longer having to purchase the Scantron sheets and annual maintenance agreement. She added there is always the potential risk that Remark will increase its costs in future, but that cannot be predetermined.

Senator Boynton asked what the Senate’s role is in the decision making process. Dr. Ehrlich responded that the recommendation would go to the Interim Provost and to IT Governance. Senator Tasdan asked if different companies were considered. Ms. Slater responded that different companies were considered, but Remark has by far the best overall approach. She added that University Technology [illegible]

((a)11(t)-5([illegible]

e att7(riRn)11(t)-5(r72(nsa)-2(a)11(t)-5o)r72(t)-5-aaare9[(c)-2(mt61(m)74(e)-2ndaa)-2(t)-5rina(w)5oo

Motion: To return the report to the agenda (Hironimus-Wendt/Franken)

MOTION TO RESTORE THE REPORT TO THE AGENDA APPROVED 19 YES – 0 NO – 2 ABSTENTIONS

Senator Hironimus-Wendt stated that he assumes that WIU owns the Scantron machine currently being used, but he wonders if the University would lose the ability to use it if the switch is made to the Remark system. Ms. Slater responded that the University could continue to use it, but she would recommend dropping the maintenance and not purchasint9851.141v-d e -ht5pv, boon >>s32f f-3.5s td.44,ion >>oa9-s-sutin6Con6>B1a56(- U)5()d

said he abstained because he does not know if he would be comfortable using the system. Ms. Slater will work to get the Remark OMR system set up on a PC in Stipes 126 so that faculty can try it out.

IV. Old Business

A. Size of the Senate

Chairperson Rock related that the fall reapportionment will result in the size of the Senate being reduced from 23 senators to 20. The Executive Committee has proposed an alternative model which would freeze the number of senators at 23; reduce the number of at-large senators from six Macomb and one Quad Cities to four Macomb and one Quad Cities; and divide the remaining 18 senators between the four academic colleges based on their proportion of total full-time faculty. Chairperson Rock stated that research has shown that the at-large faculty members were originally set at six because there were six academic colleges at the time; the Quad Cities senator was added later. With the model proposed by the Executive Committee, based on 512 faculty (the official faculty count during Fall 2018 reapportionment), there would be seven Arts and Sciences senators, four Business and Technology and Education and Human Services senators each, and three senators for Fine Arts and Communication. Chairperson Rock told senators this (hi)6(s)-2om, and4 bg (or)-d4

details will be hammered out. Chairperson Rock responded that the Executive Committee will

B. Committee on Provost and Presidential Performance

Chairperson Rock asked to add a

started and how it was revised. Senators suggested that this bullet point state "To look at the original **intent** and revised objectives and goals of FYE and determine if it is meeting them."

Motion: To accept the charge (Rahman/Allison)

MOTION APPROVED 19 YES – 0 NO – 1 ABSTENTION

Motion: To adjourn (Roberts)

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Susan Czechowski, Faculty Senate Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary