

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 18, 2025
Morris Library, Room 752/754 or Teams Option
Time 1:00-3:00pm

I. Call to Order: Yueh-Ting Lee

The March meeting was called to order by President Yueh-Ting Lee.

II. Roll Call: Michael Hylin

Present: Lingguo Bu, Kwangho Choiy, Marissa Ellermann, John Farrish, Laurel Fredrickson, Timothy Hurley, Michael Hylin, Ghassan Ishak, Mehdi Ashayeri Jahan Khanemloo, Yueh-Ting Lee, Sarah Lewison, Khalid Meksem, Cinzia Padovani, Kaitlyn Poirier, Amber Pond, Louis Premkumar, Jeffrey Punske, Jun Qin, Walter Ray, Jonathan Remo, Julia Rendleman, Mohtashim Shamsi, Jennifer Sherry, Ahmed Torky, Rachel Whaley, Jennifer Walker, Lichang Wang, Geoffrey Young

Absent: Nwamaka Anaza, Gary Apgar, Randall Auxier, Daniel Bronke, Christopher Chiasson, Lorelei Ritchie (Proxy Dale Aschemann-absent), Seyed Yaser Samadi, Christopher Wienke (Chair Proxy - Mohtashim Shamsi)

Guests: Jebaraj Asirvatham, Julie Dunston, Rachel Frazier, Shelly Gehrke, Melissa Laake, Austin Lane, Daniel Mahony, Kimberly Morgan, Kenneth Mulligan, Mark Peterson, Constantinos Tsatsoulis, Sheryl Tucker, Susan Wegmann

III. Approval of Minutes from February 11, 2025

Motion: R. Whaley

Second: J. Remo

A vote commenced: 16 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The minutes from February 11, 2025, were approved as presented.

IV. President's Report: Yueh-Ting Lee

We sent off the February Issue of FS Update/FYI Publication. I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Jeff Harmon for his help in gathering information for us on behalf of the Chancellor's Office. I am very grateful to Senator Amber Pond and Ms. Melissa Laake for their assistance in this issue. As you know, SIU Carbondale is now an R1 institution. I attended an event briefly to recognize and celebrate SIU on February 17, 2025. On February 24, 2025, I had a brief Team meeting with Chancellor Lane on SIU 2030 Strategic Plan and the best practices. We talked about how to increase our faculty's salaries at SIU that will be commensurate with other R1 peer universities. On February 25, 2025, at 8:00 a.m., we had a coffee meeting with Chancellor Lane and Provost Tucker in Old Main at the Student Center. Approximately 25 faculty members showed up and chatted with us about various topics informally. I participated in the Saluki Takeover in St. Louis at Busch Stadium where I met and chatted with SIU Alumni. During spring break, I attended a brief meeting with some of the Chancellor's cabinet members to discuss an issue related to School of Medicine faculty on leave.

V. Special Guest--SIU President Daniel F. Mahony

President Mahony provided updates from the state, federal, and system levels. President Mahony stated you may have seen in the Governor's budget address he talked about a 3% increase across board for higher education. So, that would be a 3% increase in general appropriations. Frankly, we were thinking it might be nothing given the way the state budget is, but I always point out two things. One is it could still be nothing. This is the first step in a process that will last until the end of May/early June. And the other thing is, it's important to point out when we talk about a 3% increase in general appropriations, that's not a 3% increase in our budget overall. That's just in the general appropriations part, which is really about a third of our budget or less. So, it's not as big of an increase as it sounds, but that's still much better than we expected. He also (in that budget

address) talked about bachelor's degrees at community colleges. I think there's going to be a hearing tomorrow night to talk about that, and we'll see where that ends up. With the exception of the University of Illinois, the rest of the institutions have opposed that, at least as it's currently written. It's a little bit too broad and what it would allow for community colleges to do, and certainly there is a great fear of creating 60 four-year institutions. I particularly focused on my discussions with Community College Presidents and others and things like the BSN program, which we already offer online to students across the state. And that was one of the examples the Governor used to create BSNs at community colleges; I don't know how that doesn't create unproductive competition. And that's the term I've been using - we were trying to avoid unproductive competition. We had a good meeting with Community College Presidents yesterday in Bloomington. I'm hopeful that we'll get to a point where we can at least be in agreement on what the legislation is going forward, and it'll be narrow enough that it would not create that competition. It may be more in the creation of applied bachelor's degrees that are very specific to things where they have the ability to teach them something we would simply not be teaching. But at this point we are still opposed with that. It could change as the session goes forward, and since it was in the Governor's speech, it is clearly a high priority. I think legislators are mixed on it, but it's a high priority for the Governor, and they don't want to go against the Governor. The other big piece of legislation is the funding formula. This has been worked on about four years now. I will say I was looking it up about a year and a half ago when they ran the kind of first modeling. It showed that SIU Carbondale was the best funded institution in the state. Right away I said that this just can't be right. And as we started to look at how they got to that number, there were really a few major issues (three in particular). One is they were counting our endowment earnings as part of our resources available, which is really conflating restricted funding with unrestricted funding. And it really would have killed our fundraising going forward. A. Pond stated the endowment is specific to the university - put aside by the university. It's basically our money that we have because we put it away, right? President Mahony stated the way the model works is they establish an adequacy target for each institution. So, based on the size of your student population, the demographics, this is how much resources you need. And then the second column is these are the resources you have available. And they were saying well, you have that available and we're like, yeah, but we can't use it the same way we can in general appropriations from the state, which are flexible and not restricted. Those are restricted and can only be used for certain purposes. On top of that, if we tell a donor that, if you give us money, it's going to reduce our state support by exactly the amount spent from the endowment that you created. I don't know how you ever get anybody to give money again. So again, that was one all the institutions were against and unanimous on. It still took us two years of fighting to finally get that out of the model, and I will say at this point it is out of the model. Problem number two for us is when they looked at the cost of particular programs, and for us, the biggest one was probably the medical school. They essentially said ok there's the regular cost program, so I'll take my sports management program that cost about this. Medical school - that's probably double sports management. Actually, it's probably 16 times as much to educate a medical school student as it is an undergraduate in sports management. So, they were vastly off of how they were basically estimating the cost of medical school students. For us in Edwardsville, (dental, pharmacy, physician assistants) all of those programs were much, much more than double the cost of a typical undergraduate student. We finally got to a point where I'm happy with where that is at. We are now at, I think it was 1400% as opposed to what they originally had. A. Pond asked so, the medical school, does it not also generate some money or is that basically negligible to the cost? President Mahony stated it is for the most part. What we try to do in the model is say this is kind of more the general operating cost as opposed to the other things. So, we all have other things. We have housing operations, food operations, clinical operations for medical school, and athletics - we're not going to include that in the model. It's not really the state's role to fund those things. That's kind of self-supporting independent things. We're going to focus on the cost of educating students and kind of the general operating costs. We are now at a point where what they're estimating is the cost of medical school

students is pretty close to what is reasonable for us, so that made a big, big difference for Carbondale. Like I said originally, when we were the best funded, I think in the formula we were going to get about \$28 million over the next 15 years out of the \$1.4 billion that was given to higher education institutions. So, we would have gotten a very, very small part. Breaking the medical school out and dealing with it better, probably added \$40 or \$50 million to that alone. The third problem was when they looked at tuition originally, what they did was they came up with this concept of equitable student share. No one can explain it, and no one could understand it. It was very similar to what they did with the K12 funding and looking at property tax revenues. And basically saying, if you're a more affluent community, your property taxes should cover more of the cost of education than a less affluent community. They try to do the same thing with students. But what they fail to recognize is with this Saluki Commitment our lowest income students actually aren't paying anything in tuition in the first place, so that doesn't really make any sense. In higher ed, we are already kind of accounting for some of those fiscal differences that students bring to us. So, I kept arguing you need to look at net tuition revenue - what do we actually get from students? And then if you want to apply an equity lens to that, then that makes sense. You can't estimate what we don't have, and in fact in Carbondale, the amount that they estimated was \$40 million more than what we actually have in that tuition revenue. So, they were way, way off of what I knew we had. A. Pond asked, so they were assuming that low-income students were paying? President Mahony stated no, they were actually assuming that all high-income students were paying the full cost. They were also assuming that no graduate assistant ever got a graduate assistant tuition waiver. That for us is about \$16 million; that's massive. So, there were these assumptions that went into it that just don't match reality. The price of being an R1 institution is you have graduate assistantships and doing tuition waivers. So, they finally have taken the net tuition rate/tuition revenue and then put in equity adjustment on that - so it went from our equitable student share being like \$112 million to now it's estimating \$61 million. That ends up being about now \$50 some million-dollar difference for Carbondale. So, at the end of the day, we're actually looked at slightly less funded than the average in the state, which is probably about right. It was a two or three-year journey to get us to this point of me having to kind of keep explaining this over and over again, but we're in a better place on that. I was talking with Senator Bryant the other day and stated that I'm 100% supportive and I probably will be out there vocally supporting the formula as it is. It makes sense the way it is for now. I will say before you start spending all of that money, U of I does not do well in the formula. And I would expect they will battle against it. So, where it ends up at the end of the day, I don't know, but we're in much better shape than we were a year and a half ago. I will say we do our House testimony (Chancellor Lane and I will be there) Thursday morning. We have SIU system day at the Capitol, but I will tell you a couple weeks ago we had Salukis in Springfield when our students came and spoke with our legislators. That's still the best thing. They'd much rather listen to them; they did a fantastic job. We got a great group of student leaders who were there, so that was a lot of fun. At the federal level, there are multiple things you have been watching for the month. The NIH discussion of decreasing the overhead rate to 15% would have a massive impact on any institution that does any NIH funded research. We were in that \$5-\$6 million range of what we would lose, which would still be quite significant. They're also looking at grants much more closely and really getting into details. We had, I know, one grant where they questioned whether we were asking questions about race and gender. They wanted us to take those questions out. In that particular case, I will say it was irrelevant to the studies of the research going on. We've seen the dear colleague letter, I'm sure at this point, which was incredibly vague and the executive order, which was incredibly vague. The thing I keep pointing out to everybody is the law has not changed. The law is still the law. If we were not violating anti-discrimination laws, which 14th Amendment Title 6 students for fair admissions, then we're still not violating the law. And that's our perspective. So, we have no plans to change simply because of a letter or an executive order that is incredibly vague and really doesn't provide any clear guidance. They did come out with FAQs about ten days ago that were a little bit clearer, but still vague and still not clear that some of the things they said we can't do

actually are illegal. So, I think again it stretches the law quite a bit. So, our commitment remains the same. We're kind of dealing with things on a case-by-case basis. AAUP came out with the request of presidents not to participate in anticipatory obedience. I've used that term frequently. I think that's a good way to think about it is we're not going to do things because there might be a problem down the line. One because I don't want to make changes that are actually detrimental to our goals and to our commitments, but also because I don't think it'll matter. You may have seen 50 institutions who were put on a list to be investigated by the Department of Education this week. I think 43 of them were because they participated in the Ph.D. project, which is designed to increase the diversity of Ph.D. students in business. Under the Ph.D. projects list was the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky. The University of Kentucky basically caved on everything. They took DEI off of everything. I actually heard their Council speak at a conference. University of Louisville didn't make any changes. The list that came out on Friday included Kentucky and didn't include Louisville. So, the idea that if you just obey that you'll be fine, that clearly is not the case. There are lots of questions about how they're actually going to investigate people since they're firing almost everybody who would be a part of these investigations, including the entire Chicago OCR Office. So, it's very strange to figure out where this goes next. So again, our strategy has been, let's keep doing what we're doing. If we have to deal with things, we'll deal with them as they come along, but we're not going to do anything in advance. Again, no anticipatory obedience is our kind of mantra, and we just try to keep up with change. It's been hectic to try to constantly guess what's coming next, but that's what we've been trying to do. Staff have been working really hard on that. People on the campuses were really helpful. We had at one point where we thought we were going to lose all our access to federal funding. And so, we were scrambling to draw down every dollar we could. Finance staff did a great job of finding backward ways in the systems to get our money out. So, kudos to them. But that's the type of stuff we've been dealing with. On brighter news, I did want to let you know the SIU system won an award from the National Association of Higher Education Systems - Seeding for Change Award. It's an award that focuses on the collaboration between Carbondale and Edwardsville on the SIU system online. I think for those of you who've been here for a while, the idea that Carbondale and Edwardsville won a collaboration award at a national level really does show we've come a long way, I think in the last few years, and we were quite proud of that. VP Gireesh Gupchup led that. APAP Julie Dunston and Wendell Williams were involved with that, and a lot of other people did a lot of work on it. So, that was great. Last thing I'll mention, I've started a new podcast that I've been working on for the last couple of months. Chancellor Lane was on the first one, but more importantly on the second one is Lidell Miller, who is a student here at Carbondale with a great turnaround story. He started out badly here, then with a lot of support he ended up with 4.0 last semester. My interview with Lidell was probably the highlight of what we've had so far, so definitely worth listening to him.

Q&A:

R. Whaley stated she was just at a regional Association of Midwest Sociological Programs and heard what's going on in all the states. Two Illinois schools pre complied on some things – changing the names of diversity centers, but most have not. We now have alumni who are having to censor themselves in the classroom.

President Mahony stated the Attorney General is following the cases on our behalf and have been wonderful to work with.

W. Ray stated back to the bachelor's at community colleges, I suppose it's the community colleges sort of pushing this thing, and why is University of Illinois not opposed? **President Mahony** stated the chair of their board used to be the Deputy Governor for education under Pritzker. So, I think there's some political pressure from there on board. The other is from an enrollment standpoint; they will hit their numbers regardless of what happens in community colleges, so the impact on that is minimal. When you compare that to some of the other institutions in the state with one of them, I think 50% of their incoming students are transfers, so for them a massive increase in community college baccalaureate could be devastating. What we talked about with

the community college presidents on Monday is first we look to collaborate, and if that doesn't work, then start the program. We have great relationships, and they want to collaborate with us.

L. Wang stated I was wondering in the funding formula there's a preparation for students based on the status of a university. Now you say it's R1. Will that be adjusted accordingly in the funding? **President Mahony** stated yeah, they did have an original draft of the legislation they said based on what would have been the 2022 Carnegie classification to get this much money, and I pointed out they needed to do it based on the most recent version of the Carnegie classification. So, we will get the R1 money. I made sure they corrected the language on it.

J. Sherry asked if it was Governor Pritzker's idea to focus on community colleges offering a bachelor's degree to possibly decrease the cost for students across the state. It doesn't make a whole lot of sense to have programs be very close to university settings, and hopefully someone is able to communicate that issue.

President Mahony stated the cost issue came up less in our conversation with the community college presidents. They recognize with the Saluki Step Ahead that we are giving scholarships in those second two years which is reducing the cost. They've all signed those agreements. The presidents of the community colleges know this is not necessarily going to be cheaper. It'll probably be a very similar cost.

A. Pond stated when she taught at a community college it seems to me (at least in Indiana) that the focus was on not just the first two years of college, but on readying people. It seems to me that if they try to do a bachelor's degree, then they are trying to be all things to all people. It would be better if they focused on getting people ready and giving a broader education because not everyone needs a 4-year degree. We need electricians and auto mechanics. **President Mahony** stated they've really increased the dual credit work that they've done as well, which is a huge contribution. That's one of the things why I think we were behind a lot as a state compared to other places I've been where a lot of students would get associate degrees before they got to us after they graduated from high school. I think there's more work they could do there, and I think them focusing on that again with maybe an isolated bachelor's program here or there would make sense. I think that makes a whole lot more sense to all of us and then collaborating whenever we can collaborate. We don't want any unproductive competition. Let's go with productive collaboration.

VI. Q and A Session with Chancellor and Provost

A. Chancellor Austin Lane

Chancellor Lane stated welcome back from spring break. To piggyback on the community college piece – relationships really matter. The team and I have met with all of our community college presidents in our region. None of them want to offer a bachelor's degree. They're not interested because of the work you guys did a couple of years ago with Saluki Step Ahead. We have the top 12-14 transfer programs that our faculty and their faculty at the community colleges agreed that if they started taking those courses in the first two years, it would be guaranteed to transfer. The real issue with the community college presidents is that they send students away after two years with an average of 85 hours. The majority of those hours are not being applied towards a degree; they're being applied to the transcript. So, our request to the community colleges (Kaskaskia, Rend Lake, Shawnee, & Logan) is that as soon as you admit your students in the freshman year, we want them also duly admitted with us. It's harder to do that even though we have a relationship with College of DuPage and Harper, we're going to Harper Friday to pitch the same thing. We do have 48 agreements signed with Saluki Step Ahead, but we'll need to expand probably those 12 to 14 programs that we have. Eighty percent of community college students still go to community college to transfer. That's national data. Our partners are asking us, in some cases, to come to their actual locations or satellite campuses to teach. We have a few pockets of where we could possibly teach. The southern Illinois Saluki Takeover is April 2-23, 2025. We need you to go to the high schools as we celebrate the students that have already been admitted and answer student questions. The capstone to that event is at Walker's Bluff - to have everybody that has been accepted, along with the principals and superintendents. We are feeling pretty good about fall enrollment, and we're working hard on transfer enrollment. Dr. Lee mentioned our special (informal) meetings. Those are going great. We had at our last meeting 25 faculty. We do follow up on the

questions that come up. As the President mentioned, we'll be in Springfield at the first hearing (House hearing). The Senate hearing is in April. I have a summary cheat sheet that covers everything factually about the institution when it comes to enrollment or demographics or any type of funding. I'll share it with you if you want to see it. At our Board meeting you will hear us introduce a couple of fees that have been approved and vetted with our students. The Undergraduate Student Government created a resolution for a mental health fee that will be put up for approval in April. Hopefully, you know about the Follett Bookstore Project where our students have to opt out if they don't want to be a part of it, but they will have their textbooks on day one. That's the issue we're finding in our retention data and even in the data that Follett found - we have quite a few students that go through the whole semester with no books. We have a meeting each day at 4:30 p.m. I know Dr. Punske is joining us and he's welcome to invite anyone to that meeting. It's our debrief meeting for things that are happening in Washington with executive orders. Hats off to Dr. Tsatsoulis as a lot of the impact actually has been in his world, but he has done an amazing job to stay on top of it and to stay informed. We're working with the state Rep now and a congressman on one of the items that we need to get approved over in our head start. And I think that's going to go well. I just signed that today. The last thing I will mention, and I talked to Doctor Lee about this, you probably heard some announcements come from SIUE in reference to layoffs and some things that they were considering there. So, our strategy is a little different from SIUE. #1. Our focus is always undergraduate, graduate, and online enrollment. Those have been the keys to our success. Our enrollment has increased, which has allowed us to have better tuition revenue. They've had some struggles with enrollment. #2. We have a hiring chill in place. It was put in place for a reason really to deal with what you're hearing out there today - to get us in a much better position. So, that hiring chill will continue on. It's a better strategy, I think, than trying to lay people off. I got a report yesterday from CFO Susan Simmers - we're looking pretty good in terms of our spending down the stretch. We're looking at about \$1.7 million to our \$9.6 million payback, which is a good sign for us and having an operating budget that's balanced finishing the year. We will be watching and making sure that budgets are not overspent. That was the issue the last couple of years where if you were allocated a certain amount, for some reason, you blew that by half a million and thought we'd save you. So, we have a little more control in place to deal with that. #3. The other area is retention. Our retention numbers are getting better. We have a campus wide retention model that we will unveil that I think is going to help us get even better on our fall-to-fall retention, fall to spring retention, and four-year, six-year rates for graduation. You can't just recruit. You have to retain as well. Those things have to work together. #4. The other area is our academic programs that have been submitted to IBHE that are low performing programs - that typically happens every year. We know our programs have been submitted; the problem is a lot of our Deans and directors and others don't have a clue. So, the Provost and others are making them aware of what's been submitted. We will take a look at those programs. Our Deans will work with our faculty and directors in those areas, and we'll start to do some assessments to find out what that program even needs or what it doesn't have, what it could use, or if there's a way for us to beef it up. We'll have that discussion instead of being so abrupt in terms of just saying it's gone. I'm not proposing to the Board any layoffs for us. We're already pretty thin as it is, so the hiring chill is really just an assessment of any position that becomes available, particularly the staff positions, more so than faculty. We're trying to decide if we need them back on the books or not.

B. Provost Sheryl Tucker

Provost Tucker stated as a follow-up from President Mahony and Chancellor Lane, one of the things we're working with our community college partners is part of this excessive hours being transferred to us is the dual credit enrollment in high school. So, in high school, students are doing a lot of that dual credit whether it's relevant to the degree that they ultimately want to

achieve. They don't know that at the time of their junior/senior year, and they just want those college credits. It weights their GPA and helps them get scholarships, but then they're coming to us with those extra 12-15 hours. So, we are working with our partners. It's not just this four-year institution. Now, community colleges are having the same issue. President Mahony talked about collaboration. We are doing a lot more collaboration across the system. For example, some of you have been involved with our catalog software project (we don't have catalog software), and we worked with SIUE. The two campuses have come together, and it looks like we are going to purchase the same product collaboratively; we are working on a better deal. I do want to give a shout out for those who got to see the Illinois Supreme Court in session here this morning. That was a fabulous opportunity; we had over nearly fifty schools and over 500 school children join the university for that event, as well as, faculty, staff, students, community leaders, judges, etc. So, I really appreciate those that were involved and had a chance to see that. In terms of searches, the Library Dean candidates, two of the candidates are here this week. If you get an opportunity to visit with them, please do. If you don't, at least go out and look at their resumes, etc. There's a possibility of a third candidate, but the scheduling is so late. We're going to look at these first two and make a decision from there as to whether we go into the next month. To just reiterate what Chancellor Lane said about IBHE, the APEER of low producing programs, we certainly are looking at that with Deans now and luckily, we were out in front of this before the legislative bill sort of came out of the blue. But please know, I personally have a great reluctance to continue to add programs to our portfolio, because I've got some data that I'll start sharing with the executive committee next month. For the size school we are, we have a significantly higher number undergraduate degree programs we offer here compared to our peers. And so that's part of where you start getting low numbers is we sort of dissected programs into smaller and smaller pieces, and I think that's something we want to think about because we want to plan for the future and be successful. We do want to present to the Executive Committee and then to the Council the retention model. We'll get that together hopefully in April, even with the takeover tours. We will have the Honors Program Director search. That ad is finalized and should be out very soon; it's with HR. We still have an opportunity to finish that up before people leave off of contract into the summer.

R. Whaley stated her colleague, **Professor Ken Mulligan**, is here and was invited to share his experience in creating an online program and the issues that came up. **K. Mulligan** stated we, political science, decided unanimously to start an online BA program. We have the pieces in place to do that. And there's not a lot of precedent for this in COLA. There are currently two online programs in COLA. History has been doing it for a couple of years. They have increased their majors by 20% and had 38 Saluki Step Aheads as a result of their online BA program. However, immediately after us deciding that we're going to do this, it came down that we cannot do it if we don't have overloads for the purpose of maintaining an online BA program. We just would not be able to do it. We already have our graduate students in the classroom. Assuming it's more than cost recovery, would you be open to the possibility of allowing overloads for the purpose of maintaining the starting of an online program? **Provost Tucker** stated that to me is an appropriate use of overloads to start a new program, an emergent situation. What we don't want to happen, which I believe did happen in history, the whole program in the past was designed on an overload model. So, we don't want it to be this is the long-term plan. It needs to be this is about start up, and then what is the plan to get us to a normal in-load model? So, that makes sense to me. That is part of what we've discussed with Deans. That's one of the reasons one might offer overloads to initiate something new. **K. Mulligan** stated we could not do an online BA without overloads. We do not have the faculty to do an in-load. **Provost Tucker** stated that's where we have to look at what is faculty workload, what are we doing with course rotations, etc. Because being an R1 institution and having our faculty teach overloads all the time doesn't give you any opportunity for your scholarly work. Students are there and they need your attention. They end up taking priority

and you lose the opportunity to keep doing your scholarly work. But let's meet, sit down and figure out: What are the faculty you have now, Is everybody doing the workload that they need to be doing and having the time they need for scholarship, and then, What can we do and what would that take? **K. Mulligan** stated if we're not able to sustain it, then we think it would be honestly unethical to start it if we can't keep it going. **Chancellor Lane** asked do you think your enrollment will increase enough in those areas that will allow . . . K. Mulligan said, "Additional hiring?" **Provost Tucker** stated, "Yes." Chancellor Lane stated I think what the Provost is saying is ok.

S. Lewison's questions were read by C. Padovani. S. Lewison stated regarding the hiring chill - Do you know that the shortages of staff are negatively affecting our programs and faculty capacities? Regarding the payback - Is there any place where financial paybacks are tracked over the last five years so that we can have an understanding of it? Each year, we are told that it is the last year of paying back the loan, but it seems not. **Chancellor Lane** stated the hiring chill was put in place in 2022, but we still hired about 340 people. So, a hiring chill is an assessment of positions that become open that we decide whether we need to bring back or not. What we have found over the last three years is that many of those positions we've actually did not need, so we haven't rehired those positions. That has helped us to be able to do things like negotiate with the Faculty Association for the historic increases that was just approved. So, if you put more people on the payroll, it lessens your ability to be able to give the raises that we've been able to give over the last three years, in addition to negotiating the contracts for all 27 unions. So, we can't have it both ways there. We were talking yesterday with our CFO. We think we're going to put another \$1.7 million to knock down the deficit to about \$7 million. We're doing that just to be good stewards of our dollars and to try to get to a place where we can actually have a reserve at some point in time. The bigger focus has been on our day-to-day operating budgets. I mentioned earlier that even though we've been allocated dollars to certain areas, there has been some spending that has gone over and above those amounts. So, we really place more of a focus on our operating budget in terms of our state appropriations, our income fund in terms of what we have to operate. That keeps us away from laying people off. If we didn't have a hiring chill, we probably would be talking about laying people off because our budget and payroll wouldn't be able to handle that. So that is our strategy going forward - to continue the chill, to continue to make sure the hires that we do allow to come through go towards things that are really helping us in in key areas across the campus. That is going to be extremely important going forward. As you heard, the governor has proposed a 3% increase. For us, what does the 3% mean once it goes to system and then it's split? That's about \$2.6 million is what it means for us. So, you can count on that money being already spent with some of the contracts that we have in place where we're paying faculty and staff.

K. Meksem stated it seems the first thing to do is to ask all units within the university to do kind of a self-evaluation of their programs and from there go to what we should focus on.

Provost Tucker stated we have been asking the Deans to be working on that (look at faculty workloads, course rotations, etc.) **K. Meksem** stated I suggest that faculty need also to report if they're involved in any research or scholarly activities and how much percent of time, but also to report about their productivity. **Provost Tucker** stated there will be accountability for the workloads going into this next year. And I know the FA has been involved in these discussions with us, and we thank Jeff for that. If you're a 40/40/20 teaching, research and service and you're no longer research active that's a choice, and that's fine. We all change what we do throughout our careers. Yes, you would be expected to teach more. If you get a big research grant, you may need to buyout time and be 20/20/60 faculty member, potentially, 60% being research. We need everyone to look at their workload and fairly assess where they're contributing. As an R1, the scholarly work is critically important. We all need to contribute, and we'll all contribute different from, not less than. Just like when we talk about

NTT faculty and tenure track faculty. It's just different from, it's not less than. And so, there's been a real push this year, and I think Jeff can agree with that because he hears when there's concerns; we will continue to do that. But if you are aware that those conversations aren't happening, let me know because all the Deans have been asked to look at this. And again, we need to make sure that the degree programs we're offering are relevant, they're what students need, and then we're offering the courses for timely degree completion. That may mean an elective is only taught once every two years. But as long as the student knows that's when it's taught, then we make sure they get done with their degree program on time. But there are some places we can't be teaching an elective course every semester, or maybe even every year. We have to be essentially more efficient with our resources to make everybody's work life balanced. **K. Meksem** stated there are no performance measures to quantify research productivity. So that's why it's very important to come up with those measures, then we can move forward and adhere to R1 status now.

VII. Update/report by VCR/Dean of Graduate School: Dr. Costas Tsatsoulis

VCR Tsatsoulis stated March 4, 2025, we had, in what is now the Gower Translational Research Center, a Southern Tech meeting. We had eight research presentations. The goal of the Southern Tech (it's organized by the Office of Innovation & Economic Development) is to build businesses and ignite growth in the area. We had a lot of regional businesses that participated. We had eight of our faculty give presentations, and we also had a presentation by the regional director of the DOD SBIR/STTR Office. There was participation by Apex, the SBDC, the research park, and so on. It was a great meeting that highlighted research in the biotechnology area. On the 5th of March, we organized in the Student Center Ballroom the Graduate Student Recruiting and Retention forum. The title was, "Sharing Best Practices from Inquiry to Commencement." There was a lot of participation from the directors of graduate studies, Deans and other faculty, and of course the Graduate School. We looked at a number of topics, e.g., the accelerated masters, the action plan following up of 2023 graduate student forum, concurrent degrees, graduate student success efforts, the rise point of online programs, international students and I20. We also had a graduate student panel moderated by the Assistant Dean, Rose Moroz and me. This was also a very, very successful. Tomorrow, March 19, 2025, from 10-2pm in the Student Services Building, Room 150, we have a meeting of directors of graduate studies. Some of the topics we'll discuss tomorrow are recruitment and admissions. The Graduate School website has been improved, but we need to discuss about how to find professional development funding that we give for our students, how to find funding for students, I-20s, registration, records, faculty status, graduate faculty status, formatting and submission of the final papers, graduation clearance, fellowships, and graduate catalog changes (making sure that our directors of graduate studies are fully aware where all the changes have happened the last couple of years). Our applications as of Monday for graduate studies were 2,151. Last year, the same period with 2,150. So, we're one up; good job. But unfortunately, our admissions are down by 22%. We've admitted 493 students compared to 638, our Ph.D. admissions are up, but our masters admissions are down by 25%. It's very important for us to move on with admitting students. I realize that an application is not always complete. We count the students as having applied if they pay the application fee, but they may have submitted no other information. At the same time, I'm just comparing last year to this year, and I'm seeing that we're down by 22%. And also, we've only admitted 13% of our domestic applicants. With potential changes coming in the I-20s - with some delays we've seen the last few years in the I-20 where students need to move to the next semester and so on - I would strongly recommend that we look carefully at our domestic students and move on to make sure that we get an appropriate number of graduate students. The last thing I wanted to talk about is about our research performance. We closed the books for February, so we have four months to go until the end of the

fiscal year. We have submitted proposals - the faculty has submitted proposals for \$109 million. Compare that to \$49 million last time this time of year. Last year, though, we did find a maximum 188, so a lot of proposals, large proposals were submitted last year in April, May, March and so on. Unfortunately, our awards are \$40 million compared to \$50 million last year. Some of it has to do with the fact that some of the agencies were shut down for a period of time. Also, for example, a lot of NIH panels did not happen - a lot of the review panels did not happen. So, there have been some delays in what's going on with federal funds and hopefully in the next couple of months I will have better news in terms of our awards.

A. Pond asked what is the likelihood of indirect costs being cut? **VCR Tsatsoulis** stated we should be going after foundation funds regardless. Foundations are a huge funder of a lot of research. Some of them are huge foundations, the Google Foundation, the Exxon, etc. Some others are smaller funding humanity, social sciences, the arts, etc. So, regardless of what the indirect rate may be in the future, I think it's going to be very important for us to continue working with foundations. Just so you know, we have access to the library to a database (Candid) of 60k more foundations, and our faculty can go. It's a product that costs about \$18-20k a year, so it's not cheap and our faculty can go and search for foundations based on what is their mission, what requirements they have in terms of who they fund, and what areas they fund. Right now, we are working with sixteen of our faculty (most of them are junior faculty) to teach them how to write better proposals. Three of these faculty are aiming to submit proposals to foundations, so this is not something we're not doing. It's something we've been mildly successful at, and it's something we need to continue to do.

YT Lee stated the changes in Washington, D.C., cutting the budget in research as well as, grant money may go down, to what extent will it affect our research one status within two years, because we just had over \$57 million? If grant money goes down to less than \$50 million, it will affect our research one status. What do you think? **VCR Tsatsoulis** stated keep in mind that our status, an R1 institution, is based on the three-year moving average performance of our research so we had 57 and 61. So, there is a third year which is the current fiscal year. It will depend on what our expenditures are at this current fiscal year. But also, the expenditures this fiscal year are also based on already mostly awarded grants. We're spending money this year that was awarded sometimes three years ago on a three-year grant, two years ago or this year or last year. So, I think we will be OK, because our faculty continued to submit proposals.

VIII. Reports

A. Executive Committee: Chair, Yueh-Ting Lee - (*no report*)

B. Election Committee: Chair, Amber Pond

A. Pond stated we are now in the process of taking nominations. We should have elections next week and hope to have it approved at the April meeting. After sending out a personal plea, there are now nominations for every unit. I have tried to stress the importance of having everyone's voice represented here, and that we can make ourselves a much stronger university if everyone participates. The Elections Committee, Melissa Laake and I finally got enough folks - with all of your support and talking to your constituents. Thank you!
Note: There is one more nomination needed for the School of Medicine.

C. Governance Committee: Chair, Christopher Wienke/Proxy Senator M. Shamsi

M. Shamsi stated we were planning to bring the Resolution regarding reimbursement, but we didn't have another meeting to vote, so we might be able to do it next time. Since C. Wienke is unable to attend Faculty Senate meetings on Tuesdays due to teaching during that time, we will need to find a chair to replace him/to represent the Faculty Senate. We also discussed the Faculty Senate operating paper. So, we will have an update later on.

D. Undergraduate Education Policy Committee: Chair, Jeffrey Punske

- *Resolution in Support of Change from UCC Math to UCC Quantitative Reasoning*

J. Punske stated there are no matters to vote on today. Regarding the resolution stated above, based on the bylaws of UCC (University Core Curriculum) a vote by the Senate is not needed, just approval of UEPC. The above resolution was approved by UEPC. The resolution is a change to the UCC math requirements to open them up a little bit more. It still will be determined by the major what specific math courses will be required. There will be additional space for things like logic or potentially statistics and things like that to count towards their math requirements. I believe that will be effective next catalog.

R. Whaley asked if we should act now to try to get some courses that might fulfill this UCC change. The question was deferred to J. Asirvatham. R. Whaley stated can I send you a solicitation for a course that could fit this quantitative reasoning language? J. Asirvatham said, "Yes." APAP Dunston stated just to clarify that will not be in the catalog until 2026-2027. So, it can be approved and then the form submitted for the next catalog cycle.

E. Budget Committee: Co-Chairs, Rachel Whaley and Khalid Meksem

R. Whaley stated that she was finally invited to the next Steering Committee meeting of the salary compression study with CBIZ; that will be April 1, 2025. K. Meksem stated he is still following up with possibly getting free membership to the Rec. Center for faculty with 20+ years of service. During the time with the Chancellor and Provost, the situation with our grad. students was discussed (their take home money versus how much they spend with the university). So, we're trying to find solutions to make them at ease. The average take home for a grad. student at SIU is \$1,500 net/month (\$500 is paid back to the university in the form of fees, etc.) Show me who can live on \$1k/month. There should be some solutions to put more money in the hands of our grad. students to give them a better life if we are really serious about keeping our R1 status and encouraging our graduate education.

VCR Tsatsoulis stated faculty who have external grants may offer their graduate students, their RAs more than the minimum. We have worked hard to prove that this is approved by the GAU. This is approved by legal, and some faculty are already doing it. This might be something that we need to aim for, as K. Meksem said, we are an R1 institution. We didn't become an R1 institution by having just teaching assistants. We became a research institution by having research and research assistants, and if we increase our research, we can pay our research assistants higher rates.

F. Committee on Committees: Co-Chairs, Jennifer Sherry & Gary Apgar – *(no report)*

G. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee: Co-Chairs, Gary Apgar & Dale Aschemann

- Revoke RESOLUTION ON FACULTY EMERITUS CRITERIA by the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council-- more discussion/time will be needed

YT Lee stated we should have tabled the resolution instead of voting on it.

Motion: R. Whaley

Second: A. Pond

A vote commenced: 18 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. Revoking the Faculty Emeritus Criteria Resolution to allow more discussion was approved as presented. This resolution was previously approved at the Faculty Senate meeting on 2/11/25.

- Form a special committee for Faculty Emeritus Criteria Resolution

Motion: A. Pond

Second: R. Whaley

A vote commenced: 19 Yeas, 2 Nays, 2 Abstentions. Form a Special Committee for Faculty Emeritus Criteria was approved as presented.

H. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE: Lichang Wang

- IBHE-FAC's DEI Resolution from Senator Lichang Wang

The FAC to IBHE meeting was held via Zoom following my previous report at the FS meeting on February 11, 2025. There were two presentations. The first was by Dr. Justin Bradley, Assistant Director of Academic Affairs at IBHE, on the IAI (Illinois Articulation Initiative) updates. The second presentation, titled "*ESHI (End Student Housing Insecurity) and HOUSE Liaisons,*" was delivered by Ashley Musser Lewis, Assistant Director of Policy Research at IBHE. There was an item, which will be detailed further at the end of my report for our FS action. Details of the meeting can be found at <http://www.facibhe.org/meetings/minutes.php>. The next FAC to IBHE meeting will be held on March 21, 2025. One item that needs our FS vote is the DEI resolution, which was shared with you all along with the meeting agenda. (The resolution was read to everyone.) We want the Faculty Senate of each institution to provide their opinion on this resolution. The Senate vote would be one vote towards the passing of this resolution.

Motion: L. Wang

Second: A. Pond

A vote commenced: 22 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The endorsement from Faculty Senate for the IBHE-FAC DEI Resolution was approved as presented.

I. Graduate Council Representative: Mark Peterson

M. Peterson stated on March 31, 2025, representatives from the Grad. Council will meet with the Provost and representatives from the Faculty Senate regarding the Emeritus Criteria. In our next meeting in April, we will vote on a resolution in support of the Graduate Alternative Tuition Rate Policy change; I talked a little bit about that at our last meeting. Also in April, we will vote in support of a resolution on creating the Ph.D. in Biomedical Engineering and a doctorate in Social Work. And we are in process of Program Review on the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute.

IX. Old Business – (none)

X. New Business

- Online programs and overloads (*see section VI.*)
- *Resolution on Instructor Course Evaluations*

J. Punske stated this resolution was developed by me, a few members of Senate, and along with some non-Senators. Based in part on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Instructor Course Evaluations, we diverged from their recommendations in some significant ways. The thrust of this proposal is looking at the ways in which instructor course evaluations are used in personnel decisions given the fact that they have been shown by numerous academic studies to be problematic, to not necessarily track with learning outcomes, to show biases towards minoritized members of the faculty, or to be more about the student experience in the moment and not necessarily long term learning outcomes, etc. We don't want to discount them entirely, but the goal is just to properly contextualize them within the space of what they are meant to do, which is provide the instructor feedback and suggestions on how to evaluate. And of course they could be used

to identify larger problems, but those need to be supported by other types of evidence - is the thrust of the Resolution. The goal is just to eliminate or significantly reduce the weight of ICE scores in the use of personnel decisions. I can also say that Senator Whaley and Senator Fredrickson both participated in the production of this Resolution.

J. Rendleman asked if the last part of the resolution is just suggestions with no action behind it. For example, "SIU shall adopt and prioritize. . ." Does someone oversee that adoption and prioritization, or do we just hope that is something SIU does? **J. Punske** stated when we vote on anything, we are hoping that SIU will adopt it. We're an advisory body, so this is providing advice to the Chancellor and Provost and other administrators about how the faculty view how ICE scores should be used. **L. Wang** stated I think it will provide immense guidance for tenure and tenure promotion when the committee looks at the teaching evaluations; that's very important. Thank you.

Motion: J. Punske

Second: R. Whaley

A vote commenced: 23 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The Resolution on Instructor Course Evaluations was approved as presented.

*Note from W. Ray: One clarification for the Candid directory. You can search the databases for Candid on the library's website. But if you are looking through the databases alphabetically, you have to look under Foundation Directory.

XI. Adjournment

Motion: C. Padovani

Second: J. Remo