

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
October 14, 2025
Via MS Teams & Morris Library Room 754
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order: Khalid Meksem

The October meeting was called to order by President Khalid Meksem.

II. Roll Call: John Farrish

Present: Nwamaka Anaza, Gary Apgar, Randall Auxier, Erica Blumenstock, Lingguo Bu, Lavern Byfield, Christopher Chiasson, Kwangho Choiy, John Farrish, Erin Hascup, Timothy Hurley, Ghassan Ishak, Jenna Jamieson, Seung-Hee Lee, Sarah Lewison, Jia Liu, Khalid Meksem, Katie Moore, Cinzia Padovani, Cheryl (Shelly) Page, Kaitlyn Poirier, Jun Qin, Jonathan Remo, Nicole Roberts, Jennifer Sherry, Angela Shultz, Kang Sun, Ahmed Torky, Jennifer Walker, Haibo Wang, Christopher Wienke, Geoffrey Young

Absent: David M. Johnson, Frances T. Lee, Mohtashim Shamsi, Cassie Wagner

Guests: Jebaraj Asirvatham, Kelly Bender, Kristina Boone, James Carter, Hong Cheng, Julie Dunston, Craig Engstrom, Rachel Frazier, Shelly Gehrke, Karen Jones, Melissa Laake, Austin Lane, Peter Li, Katherine Martin, Joddy Murray, Katelyn Petrolina, Lydia Phelps, Jeffrey Punske, Kimberli Morgan, Admir Sadeghpour, David Shirley, Susan Simmers, Robert Spahr, Abby Tate, Constantinos Tsatsoulis, Juliane Wallace, William Walters, (Alan) Stewart Walters, Lichang Wang, Wendell Williams

III. Approval of Minutes from September 9, 2025

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: S. Page

A vote commenced: 25 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The minutes from September 9, 2025, were approved as presented.

IV. President's Report: Khalid Meksem

A. Low Producing Programs (reviewers approved)

B. JRB – “12 members” listed in the policy for “Grievance Procedure for Faculty” - Section IV, E, 1.

K. Meksem stated as you know, we have several programs at the university that have been identified by the Illinois Board of Higher Education as low performing programs, and there is an initiative that was started by Provost Tucker to see how we can move those programs forward. The first thing that's happening now is the establishment of a committee that will review those programs and come up with recommendations. We have requested from the Faculty Senate that Senators will be assigned to those committees to help. We did prefer that the Senators are going to be serving within the committees of their own colleges, because they are aware of what's going on. They have more knowledge and more contact with their colleges. We have reviewers that have been approved ready for that. So that's going to move forward. Judicial Review Board - the review board actually was established and the membership for it was established based on SIU many, many years ago. As you know, SIU has moved from reorg to some colleges being fused with others and loss of some colleges or some schools; we have new schools actually that are independent now. So, therefore we will have to review the membership. We have now 12 members that are listed in the policy for grievances and procedures for faculty, and that number has to change to reflect exactly the reality of SIU.

V. Vice President's Report: Jennifer Sherry

A. Search Committee Volunteer for Executive Director of Online & Extended Campus: Kwangho Choiy

B. “Send Proof” link for course evaluations

Jennifer Sherry stated Provost Tucker asked for two tenured faculty volunteers for the Faculty Senate to serve on the Search Committee for the Executive Director of Online and Extended Campus position. There will be a representative from the Grad. Council as well. These volunteers should be teaching online regularly and be

familiar with the unit. And we have Kwangho Choiy to volunteer to serve on this committee, and his name was submitted to Provost Tucker.

Motion: R. Auxier

Second: K. Meksem

A vote commenced: 26 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. Kwangho Choiy was approved as presented to serve on the Search Committee for the Executive Director of Online & Extended Campus.

Jennifer Sherry stated an email was sent to all Faculty Senators regarding the “Send Proof” link as part of the ICE course evaluations completed through the Center for Teaching Excellence and a Desire to Learn management system. This is an optional feature that enables students to send an email notification to their instructor that confirms completion and submission of course evaluations while maintaining anonymity. After meeting with Dir. Craig Engstrom, if this practice is utilized by a university or colleges, it’s either used across the board or not used at all. This feature was disabled at SIU and caused concern with some faculty. The reason it was initially disabled was a concern from a past Faculty Senate member that small class sizes may create a lack of anonymity. Some faculty want to remove the burden for students to send a screenshot of the completed course evaluation page to prove it was completed. All Faculty Senators were tasked with discussing this issue with faculty within their unit, schools, and/or colleges. The link was sent out before October’s FSEC meeting and regular Senate meeting to report the results. To clarify, a final vote will be held after discussion at today’s full faculty Senate meeting. The initial “vote” was to understand how your unit, schools, and/or colleges were thinking about this issue. We will move forward based on the consensus of the final vote at today’s meeting, and we’ll communicate results to Provost Tucker and Craig Engstrom at the Center for Teaching Excellence. I did want to report the preliminary score for this issue – (7) yes to add and (10) no to leave off. (No discussion was made.)

Motion: K. Meksem

Second: C. Wienke

A vote commenced: 18 Yeas, 10 Nays, 4 Abstentions. Motion to add the “Send Proof” link to course evaluations was approved as presented.

VI. Invited Guests:

A. Chancellor Lane

Chancellor Lane stated it's good to see everyone here on the call and hard to believe it's October already. We're already making plans for December commencement. So, thank you guys so much for your work. If you were in the enrollment retreat, I hope that was good information. I think it's the fourth time we've had that retreat. Obviously, the focus is on enrollment for fall 2026, not to forget about spring, obviously spring '26, summer '26, but fall typically is our larger semester. We have a lot of plans underway, a lot of folks with some great ideas to help us reach those numbers. I'm going to actually defer a lot of my time either to Susan Simmers or Peter Li to chime in on their items. I'm going to give them some of my time, because I know those are some interesting topics that we have for our group here.

B. Provost Tucker – (no report)

C. VCR/Dean of Graduate School: Costas Tsatsoulis

VCR Tsatsoulis stated first of all, let me say that I have really no news on research because of the government shutdown. We are meeting deadlines and submitting proposals, but there are no panels, there is no feedback happening, so we don't know anything about that. Also, we don't have precise information about the visa status for students with visa appointments. As you may know, Consulate Services are not directly affected by the government shutdown, because some of these officers have paid by the application fee for the visa. But the application fee for the visa does not necessarily cover all the salaries, so we don't know when and if this will continue. (A PowerPoint presentation titled, “Graduate Applications Update” was shared.) This was a couple of months ago - the welcome ceremony for our new graduate students. I want to go through the applications as they stand right now. These are the spring applications. Spring applications are very important for the Graduate School, because we get a lot of students who come in the spring. You will see that the number of applications is substantially down, and I would not count 2024. It

was an aberration. You can see that the admissions have been about the same, but we too - we're 180 students down. When you look at the domestic applications, you will see that the domestic applications are not particularly down and our actual admissions, domestic admissions are up. The impact that we have right now for spring is international students. So that's really what is hurting us right now. What I would recommend is that units move very quickly. If we want the students, domestic or otherwise, to be here on the 15th of January, they need to be admitted now. This is the fall applications - again, 2024 was an outlier year. We're not sure that all the applications were legitimate. You may remember there were some videos about SIU Carbondale admitting all the students and giving everybody money. So, we have a huge jump. There is a little bit of an increase, but again, notice that 78 out of the 90 students who have been admitted are international. Most of them are already transferred from fall 2025, so it's not necessarily real. But I would strongly recommend that again, it's never too late to start looking at these applicants. I have said multiple times that the yield of our domestic applicants is 70%, but that's only if we admit them. So please admit those students because right now we only have 12 domestic students admitted for the fall of 2026.

Associate Dean & Director of Graduate School: Dr. Karen Jones

Associate Dir. Jones shared a PowerPoint presentation labeled, "Graduate Student Enrollment, Fall 2025." Graduate student enrollment for fall 2025 was actually up 3% overall, 3% increase in master's students and 2% increase in doctoral students as compared to fall 2024. Go SIU or go dogs if you were at the meeting this morning. How does SIU stand next to other institutions? The Council for Graduate Studies, which were a member of that group, did a flash survey of 433 institutions and they had a 17% response rate. What they found was that doctoral student enrollment is steady or rising. Master's students saw some declines, so about the same to a little bit fewer. And the reasons that were given were there was a perceived value that you got for going to Graduate School, so your return on investment versus the cost of attending. And then that was compared with doctoral versus master's education. So, it seemed to be more important at the master's level than at the doctoral level. There were visa-related barriers for the leading reasons that students declined to come, and their worries had to do with cost, some of the political unrest, and actually some concerns about their personal safety. So, how about SIU's new international students? This is a comparison over the last five years (2021 to 2025). We actually see a little bit of a rise in registered students and then this decline here in this last year or so at the master's level. But at the doctoral level, we're still seeing a steady increase in international doctoral students. So, what does the State Department say? The State Department revisited their procedures for visa issuance, and that's one of the things Peter was talking about. So, they're looking at social media now before they issue a visa. They had paused issuing visas for a while and that impacted our students somewhat. It resulted in either delays or deferrals and we do have quite a few students who have deferred their admission semester to fall of 2026. We're actually currently reaching out to the programs of these students and asking if they would consider having those students come in spring of 2026, and if the programs said they would like to have the students in spring of 2026, then we're reaching out to those students to see if they would like to change their visa date. I was also asked to tell you a little bit about how I-20 processing works, or that's the paperwork that's involved before the visa is issued. This is just kind of a snapshot of that process. Students are admitted via Slate. And a lot of programs have different ways of doing the recommendations for admissions and then the Graduate School actually does the official admissions - admissions for masters and doctoral students. When that admissions is made, Slate, which is our CRM, automatically sends a letter of acceptance to the student, and shortly thereafter, either that same day or the next day, there's a second letter that's issued that tells the student what they need to do to get their I-20 issued. And generally, that means that they have to have some proof of funds - some dependent information if they're going to bring their family over or that kind of thing. We get that list of students and there's a daily report that's run in Slate and we identify any international students that were admitted the previous day. We start that communication contact by e-mail and this is very much a manual process at this point, all bunch of emails going back and forth. We are working with the Slate team to make that more automated to allow the students to upload materials like they would when they're doing their application, so when they are uploading their transcripts for example. We're trying to work with the Slate team to make it where there's a repository of information. But we can't do anything until the information from the student is provided to us. So, the time that it takes between admission and issuance of that I-20 is very much dependent upon the responsiveness of that student to get

us the materials that they need. And it's really a pretty simple form, the I-20. This is the I-20 to receive the F1 visa, which is a full-time student visa. Pretty much everything at the top of this - it's the student's information, what program they are in - in this column, this is the important part - how much do we estimate that it's going to cost for that student to go to school for nine months? And then, these figures over here is how does the student plan to fund nine months of being here and going to school. We have to have those two things balanced/equal out. We collect this information - I believe it's financial aid does this determination about how much it costs and that gets updated periodically, so this figure can change. Many times the assistantship, even with the tuition waiver, does not cover the entire amount that a student has to show that they have - they may have a few thousand dollars that they have to also show to make those two columns balance out. It'll be a little bit different for each student depending upon their situation and their scenario. I did want to note here that this is when it's really important that the Graduate School knows if that student is going to receive an assistantship. This is the first time that we have to know that information, so we don't need it anywhere in the admissions process, so nowhere up until this time. And then this is the place for an international student when it's important to know if they have an assistantship.

D. Center for International Education Director: Peter Li (recruitment & visas)

Dir. Li stated this fall when Census Day international student number came out it was 789, a noticeable decrease from last year. Although I was very disappointed with the figure, I also felt kind of relieved since I had feared even worse figure. I collect a relatively recent data to show you why I had such fear. (P. Li shared a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Global Reduction in Visa Approvals.") This data is two months old already. Visa issuances down 14% in early 2025 compared to 2024. Several reasons those below after this one this is talking about specific students related visa recent the 40% decline. (The 40% decline is for all types of visas issued world-wide.) This is 10 years high denial ratio for student visa - 41% this is highest. Most denied visas are from India and China, and those are two largest groups of international students we have on this campus, especially India. A survey just conducted about two or three months ago - 42% of the people say, you know what, we are going to think about somebody else. Traditionally we are called "Big Four" - that is the US, UK, Canada, and Australia. Now people start turning their attention to different countries. Another reason for visa delay or suspension is because in the past, actually before this year, for renewal it was just need to send a document. There was no in-person required by this suspend, everybody must come into the consulate to talk to visa officer. (Visa face-to-face interview waiver was offered to some visa applicants, and it's no longer an option.) That's one, two - long term delay because they have to talk to them. The data shows 7,000 Indian students alone from North Carolina were not able to start a visa appointment in time for the semester. We don't have in Illinois but it's substantial, big number also - also delay the social media. We know this year federal governments require vetting social media - the investor or applicants. So, that takes one or two weeks additional time. Visa Suspensions & Bans - There was a ban for 19 countries. Also banned for a third country, meaning you apply a visa, you need to go home, your home country - not through a different country. Those are suspension that delay or reduce the number of visa approval. Another issue we had was revocation and a service terminated. Since January, 4,700 SEVIS records be terminated. A lot of visas were revoked. If you recall earlier this year, Chancellor and our group of leaders of the campus - we had a meeting every day after 4:30 p.m. to discuss the issues, because almost every day we have somebody say, our students SEVIS records was terminated or sometimes say research grant was terminated. So, we had to spend a lot of time to deal with that. Also, as a result we had to establish a counselor service. (We invited a counselor from the office of Counseling and Psychological Services to set up a weekly meeting to help international students to deal with the crisis.) - There are many proposed changes, but two are really under my radar. One is the Duration of Status that if the public notice period just ended, then we plan to conduct a workshop campus wide because of the impact is significant (should it become law). And also, there's a bill which proposed to terminate OPT. Hopefully those changes will not happen, but it is something on the radar at this point. This one is the true figure compared to last year, August and this year. Last year August and this year of the number for actual arrivals, Asians 24% down for our campus, India, Nepal, China, those are biggest numbers - 24% down. So that's one of the reasons why I was so worried about it. Middle East 17%, Africa 32% and those are three of our biggest groups. Fortunately, the number of percentages down are relatively not that bad. The government focus on security and perceived abuse detection instead when they review student visa applications. So, what we

need to do is really monitor state government policy and we might have to consider to increase and diversify our recruitment efforts.

E. Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance: Susan Simmers

VC Simmers shared a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Southern Illinois University Carbondale Process Redesign." Since we last met, we've been working on administrative processes. Chancellor Lane shared with me a draft document that you had put together where you had outlined some administrative processes that were concerning to you and that you would like us to review and improve. We are working toward that and a couple of things that have happened since I last talked to you is I have recruited the Associate Vice Chancellor that works for me and as well as his budgetary and financial responsibilities. He's going to be helping head up process redesign projects to look at these projects, to look at these different processes on our campus - see how they're going, see where the bottlenecks are, and work to improve them. I also had a position that was retired (retired in the spring,) and I was busy recruiting that position. That position is also going to be another person who can take on some special projects and help me review administrative processes and hopefully redesign some of them to make them better for our university. I also had a really great conversation with Craig Engstrom to get his insight on how we can develop better training materials for our processes, and he's going to have some follow-up meetings with us to give us some really good suggestions since he works on this for Academic Affairs a great deal. We've also begun with my two new people to review our administrative processes. Some of the processes that we're focused on, of course travel, we've talked about travel before. And so, in the meantime, since I've spoken to you last, my AVC has met with information technology and we're looking to see what tools we have at SIU that we can use to get an electronic solution to help us route and process travel reimbursements. Also, he has reviewed the current travel process and summarized that as a starting point so we can make a project plan and look at all the pieces of it that we need to address. Another thing that was mentioned in the memo was the invoice distribution form and how we use that, especially for honorariums. So, Richard met with procurement, HR, and legal to see if we can craft a more streamlined process for honorariums. Procurement - we're looking at a system called JAGGAER, and it was implemented in this past year at the School of Medicine. I think that's a good product that maybe we can use it here at the Carbondale campus to streamline our purchase requisitions. Now, I realize we need more training, and we need more clarification on purchasing procedures here for the university. But one of the pieces of our purchasing challenges is that we're routing requisitions around on paper or through Adobe sign, and then when those requisitions get to the purchasing department, they have to rekey and reenter everything. Most purchasing systems you have a requisition module and people fill out the electronic requisition - it routes around and then becomes a purchase order in the system. So here at SIU, we're actually duplicating a lot of effort by the way our procurement system was set up. So, we're looking for a solution for that piece of it, as well as the training and some other parts. We're also looking at the transfer vouchers that was mentioned in the memo. We haven't done as much on that one, but we're reviewing that process for possible improvements. So, to move forward, Richard and Amanda, my two new folks have looked at each of these areas; we need to develop a project plan and figure out what steps we need to take to improve each process. And some of the things like steps in the plan will include handouts or step by step guides, checklists. I want to expand online demand training for people for preparers so they can go to a website and look at a training module instead of having to worry about attending something on campus, especially for faculty with your busy schedules with teaching and research. On-demand training would be so much better. We also want to have some focus groups to obtain feedback for campus as we redesign these processes. And I just want to let you know that we're committed to transparency and partnership in addressing your concerns. We will need to prioritize the projects. I don't want to try to do all of them at once, because I want them to get done. I want them to start, be worked the way through, and brought to the finish line, and then go on to the next one - so we can see some improvement. I want to make sure as we work on reviewing these processes that you've outlined, that we can focus on each one adequately, and we're not trying to juggle too many at once. So I just wanted to open that up for feedback and of the things that were mentioned in the memo, I think you would probably say travel is the highest priority, but if you were to tell me what your other higher priorities of those items were, how would you rank them for us? **S. Lewison** stated reimbursements.

F. Dean of Library Affairs: William Walters (status/negotiations with Elsevier, Springer Nature, Wiley)

Dean Walters shared a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Planned Negotiations with Springer Nature: Resetting Our Expenditures and Our Publishers' Expectations." I wanted to discuss some of our planned negotiations with Springer Nature, who is one of our main journal publishers, because we've changed the way we proceed. Before last year, we would look at list price and negotiate discounts for each journal we wanted. It's better to present them with a list of what we want and a total price, and then basically deal with them with regard to the complete the total price of all the journals we want. An important thing is that our Elsevier negotiations happened last year. Andrea Imre, who was absolutely fantastic with this, negotiated a deal with Elsevier that increased our holdings of their journals from 122 journals to 1,825. And meanwhile, she negotiated a reduction in price from \$734,000 to 524,000, which is actually a reasonably good price for Elsevier. We now have access to nearly all of the Elsevier journals. What that means, first of all, we have more journals than ever before. Second of all, because we have so many new Elsevier journals, we can negotiate more aggressively with our other publishers. We can say to them we can risk losing their journals, because we have so many more from Elsevier. So next, we're going to negotiate with Springer Nature. We only get right now 65 journals from them. But what's important about the Elsevier deal is one, it gives us more journals, but secondly, it shows the kind of deal that's possible if we bargain effectively. So, we plan on bargaining much more aggressively with Springer than we have in the past. Right now, with Springer, we get 65 of their journals at a total cost of \$296,000. That is \$4,550 per journal. We're not going to keep paying that. What we're going to do is threaten to cancel. By threatening to cancel nearly all our Springer Nature journals, my goal is to gain access to all of their journals, all 2,300 of them, at a price no greater than what we're currently paying. I think this has some chance of success, partly because publishers care most about maintaining their revenue. They are willing to give us a whole lot more than they have in the past in order to keep that revenue stream going, if they know we're not willing to pay more for that content. If they think we're willing to pay more, they're going to charge us more. But if we can convince them that we're not willing to pay more, then they may be likely to give us more, essentially for free. We gain bargaining power only if we can make a credible threat to cancel, only if we can make them believe really and truly that we will cancel if they don't give us what we want. There have been major, major changes in the publishing landscape in recent years. The most important one is this first one - 62% of the papers published in our subscribed Springer Nature journals, the ones we get right now, are freely and immediately available through Google Scholar without a subscription or any other form of paid access. This is based on actual searches we did. We found a random sample of papers published in the last two years from our Springer Journal Nature journals, the one we're getting, and we looked at a random sample of those articles and found that 62% were freely available, without a subscription. So, my point is our subscriptions don't pay for Springer Nature content. They pay only for 38% that we can't get for free. And that's where we're going to begin our negotiations with Springer, with that point in mind. I would claim that a lot of the full text downloads and views are not done because students need the paper - they're done to assess relevance. It's so easy to download, review the content that they'd rather look at than look at the abstract in the database. So, my point there is a lot of the uses, views, or downloads that are not academically essential use, but they're just done to assess relevance. We can also purchase many more articles now individually. For Springer Nature, we can get almost any article they publish for \$24. That requires a little bit of a delay, but we need to tell them subscriptions are not the only way we can get these journals. We recalculated our use statistics. We're not looking at just number of downloads or views, we're estimating cost per purchase download, meaning the ones we can't get for free of 2025+ content, meaning the content that we pay for each year with each year's subscription fee with our new use statistics, we're going to go to them and say here's our first proposal. We'll cancel all your journals except for the four, for which estimated cost per purchased download is less than \$150. Springer Nature, you'll then lose almost all of your \$296,000, but we'll go a year without them. This will put us in a much, much better bargaining position next year. Yeah, we would lose 61 of the 65 Springer Nature journals we're currently getting, but keep in mind that's in the context of this dramatic increase in our Elsevier holdings from 122 to 1,825. So, we want them to fear that we're on the verge of canceling, which we are. The best way to convince them is to do it. But of course, we want really a different outcome, and we'll present them with this other plan. Our second proposal - we will say you give us all 2300 journals; we're willing to pay up to \$250,000 for that

package. That's about \$106.00 per journal, entirely reasonable. And this is the plan we really want. But I want to say that although this is what we really, truly want, we need to be prepared to cancel our 65 or 85 Springer journals if they don't go along with it. I don't want to cancel, but Springer Nature wants us to cancel even less. So, we just sent them a list of the priorities we have and our perspectives on this. I haven't heard back from Springer yet, but I expect to hear back from them soon. Next up is Wiley. Again, 64% of the papers published in our Wiley journals are freely and immediately available. That's important. We need to tell them that and make it absolutely clear. I wouldn't negotiate so aggressively with Wiley, though, because we currently get more of their journals. We rely on their journals, and their current prices are not quite so outrageous. But the ultimate goal is to use any savings to expand our holdings of journals from other major publishers. Right now, we don't have deals with Sage or Taylor & Francis, and I want to look at those in the coming years. Basically, save money through these deals and use that money to embark on the same kinds of major deals with other major publishers.

G. Q & A

(Reference to when VC Simmers asked about priorities) - **S. Lewison** stated to VC Simmers if you get a grant and they don't give you a P-card (which they usually don't), you have to spend the money in advance and it takes a long time to get that back. If you have somebody who comes and does a service for you or you want to give them an honorarium – I have an honorarium waiting from June. It's embarrassing as heck. I'm just giving feedback on that question. **R. Auxier** stated I'm going to suggest that we take your question back into the Governance Committee to discuss priorities and bring a list to Faculty Senate. That seems the right thing to do; we haven't passed this resolution yet – today, perhaps. **K. Meksem** stated to VC Simmers we have a resolution about what you presented. Last spring we met and talked about travel vouchers and delays. We presented to you with some suggestions; you were open to those to get us through the phase until we finally have a solution for that. I know that the person who was in travel voucher left, so you hired another person. To my surprise, we were not happy last spring with waiting one month, so it seems like now that the waiting time is two months. **VC Simmers** stated summer is the busiest time of year and we have to pull together the annual budget plus the SIU consolidated financial statements plus working to recruit the employees that I need to head up these projects and get them moving forward. So, I really think in the two months even though we haven't accomplished maybe as much on that specific project as you would like to see, I've definitely accomplished a lot toward getting the people in place so that I can address these types of processes for our university. **Chancellor Lane** stated I think now we will see a little tighter in a reduced wait time with these new folks that are here, and I know the expectation that Susan will have and I'll have is not taking forever. I think we need to probably go back and look at a realistic timeline in reference to when we can turn that around, so people aren't wondering and just be really clear in terms of that processing timeline. We'll work on that piece, now that we have some folks in place, and in Susan's defense, I think a lot of it was, as she mentioned, just not enough boots on the ground, if you will. Folks are here now, so we should be able to reduce that considerably, which is the goal.

A discussion around the challenges of processing travel expenses in a timely manner, especially in relation to grant deadlines took place. K. Meksem emphasized the importance of aligning expense reporting with grant timelines, noting that delays in processing travel vouchers can result in expenses hitting after a grant has ended, which causes budgetary issues and negative balances. VC Susan Simmers explained that the delays are often due to errors and slow processing at the departmental level before the vouchers even reach Accounts Payable. Once it's received in accounts payable, their commitment is to turn it around in 30 days to get it paid. That means auditing it, processing for payment and getting it paid. She highlighted that about 85% of travel vouchers contain mistakes, with 20–30% needing to be returned for corrections (missing a receipt or a form), and stressed the need for better campus-wide training and clearer forms to reduce errors. Chancellor Lane and others discussed the need for coordination with faculty and grant managers to ensure compliance with agency reporting deadlines. VCR Tsatsoulis added that while some leeway exists after a grant ends (typically 30–90 days), expenses must have occurred during the grant period to be eligible for reimbursement. The conversation concluded with agreement that improved training and streamlined processes are essential to avoid jeopardizing grant funding due to administrative delays.

J. Sherry stated we do have a lot of new people on campus and there's a major learning curve with all of this paperwork. We need to make sure that we train folks; our onboarding process on campus is mediocre at best. We need to make sure that we really do that because this is important if you want it filled out properly, then you need to train the people to do so. **VC Simmers** stated I totally agree with that because

after having a couple of campus open sessions, that's where I think our biggest bottleneck is. We need to help the people on campus understand how to put the travel reports together. And I think we can improve some of the forms to make them easier, make some checklists and do some things like that to make the process go more smoothly for everyone and then we can get out there and do some training in person. But I also want to develop some on-demand training modules because not everybody can come and sit in a class, especially faculty. If we had a video online and available on demand, I think that would help a lot of people as well. So those are some of the things we're looking at. **Chancellor Lane** stated to VC Simmers to put a little action on it, why don't we set up (we can do this with me, you, Costas, & David) a training schedule that happens this fall, so we can get folks in there and find out how we can help them. This is an item that's been here a few times. We need to get some resolution on it. We'll have it be mandatory. How about that? And that way we help people. **S. Lewison** stated first of all, I think this is a good idea, but also when policy changes appear – when someone adds on this new location code, but they don't send me – then that became this whole new bottleneck. It took 6 months before I found out that the problem was there was this new code that you had to add in. It's actually just about promptly communicating as well and placing the learning material in the exact same location where you download the document – some kind of common-sense ways of letting people figure out how to follow protocol because it's intuitively set up for them. **J. Jamieson** stated also I think part of it is communication. I've done travel vouchers. I send emails, and then I actually wait for a week before I get a response. That's another problem, because we say that accounts payable, well, it's getting hung up in another office. Well, we also need to make sure that there's response times that are legitimate within the work week. **K. Meksem** stated how can we optimize it to make it better; I'm sure this is frustrating on both sides. **Chancellor Lane** stated I do want to introduce you to a person who's going to be helping - *David Shirley - my new Chief of Staff* and is also our institutional research effectiveness and planning. Remember Matt Boughman? David is doing a portion of Matt's work. We will put some things in place and get this resolved.

K. Meksem stated to K. Jones and P. Li it's concerning visas. So, China and India, I know that they are targeted; we used to get traditionally our students from there. But the world is made up of 200 countries. What is stopping us from approaching somewhere else? **VCR Tsatsoulis** stated I did want to point out that the majority of our graduate applicants come from Africa, which, as Peter Li showed, had a 32% denial of visas. So, we do go to Africa, we do go to the Middle East, we do go to Asia, we don't go enough to South America, that's true, or Europe, but I would recommend if you look at the Power BI, you can look at what countries our applicants come from. We have 70 plus from Nepal; we have 35 something from Sri Lanka. We do not rely on one or two countries, although China and India together are 3 billion. So, you have to go there clearly. **P. Li** stated we heavily rely on faculty and former and current students to establish connections for our staff alone. Our connection with other universities for international students is not enough.

K. Meksem stated to Dean Walters you presented a nice presentation, but when I look at it, 60% actually versus 40% is the magic number today. We all know that everybody is moving toward Open Access; it's free. When you negotiate with those major publishing houses, why offer them (x) amount of money when they are actually moving toward more and more Open Access? I would probably offer them less. **Dean Walters** stated there are two things. We are offering them slightly less than we're paying now. But the two issues are one that what we're asking for is with in the case of Springer Nature is not just the journals we're getting now, we're asking for the entire output, all their journals for the price that we're going to pay. So, what we're asking for is a dramatic increase in the content available to us. And yes, of course, most of that content will be freely available online, but the rest of it is all the rest of the journals that we're getting for free. The other issue is that publishers always talk about Open Access in terms of the content that they make available for free, the content for which authors or institutions have paid the Open Access fee. When libraries look at Open Access, we're not just looking at what is the formal Open Access provision, but at

what is really, truly available online. And that includes all the things that departments, individuals, agencies post online. And I'm concerned with the total proportion of content that is available online. Publishers will always try to switch that and talk about what they make available for free online. There's always that competing view of how to define it. But the main issue is that we're asking not just for what we're getting, but for a whole lot more. It's partly a way to cut costs, but also a way to expand our holdings as an R1 institution.

VII. Reports

A. Executive Committee: Chair, Khalid Meksem

K. Meksem stated we have actually received a lot of RMEs that we have to deal with, and I would like to say thank you very much to Jonathan Remo and his people for being on top of their work.

B. Election Committee: Chair, Jennifer Sherry

1. Filled (2) NTT FS seats to replace Marissa Ellerman & Daniel Bronke

Welcome: Angela Shultz & Jenna Jamieson (both terms are until SP26)

We would like to welcome our newest Faculty Senators Jenna Jamieson and Angela Shultz, selected from the NTT special election. We welcomed Kang Sun at the Faculty Senate meeting on September 9, 2025. All three seats are until spring 2026, and so we appreciate their willingness to serve on the Faculty Senate this year.

C. Undergraduate Education Policy Committee: Chair Jonathan Remo

1. (10) RMEs to Approve:

a. Create BFA Media Arts, eliminate Cinema BA

b. Digital Marketing Specialization

c. Minor in 3D Computer Animation

d. Minor in Animation & Game Design

e. Rename Minor in Cinema to Minor in Cinematic Arts

f. Rename BA RTD and Specializations

(Rename the BA Radio, TV, and Digital Media to Media Arts and rename the following specializations: Digital Media Arts and Animation to Animation and Game Design;

Production: Radio/Audio to Audio Arts; Production: Television/Video to Cinematic Arts)

g. TESOL UG & GR Certificate

(Add a BA/MA Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages)

h. Rename Specialization and Minor Art Education

(Rename the Specialization Art Education in the BA and BFA in Art and the Minor Art Education to Art and Design Education)

i. Minor in Applied Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management

j. Rename BS & Minor Crop, Soil, and Environmental Management to Agronomy

2. DFW and ICE report update

3. "Quiet Week" Proposal update

4. University Core Curriculum changes update

RMEs:

J. Remo stated UEPC met twice in September to review and prepare supporting resolutions for ten RMEs received from the office of the Associate Provost of Academic Programs. The first meeting was held on September 9, 2025, with UPEC members Drs. Bu, Chiasson, Choiy, Padovani, Martin, and Remo present. The Undergraduate Student Vice President for Student Affairs, Abby Tate, was also present (7 out of 8 committee members present). Representatives from the Schools of Management and Marketing and Media Arts were invited to answer questions the UEPC members had about their RMEs. During this meeting, five RME resolutions were voted on and passed unanimously by the committee members in attendance. These were Digital Marketing Specialization, Minor in 3D Computer Animation, Minor in Animation and Game Design, Bachelor of Fine Arts in Media Arts and eliminate the Cinema B.A., and Rename the BA Radio, TV, and Digital Media to Media Arts and rename the following specializations: 1) Digital Media Arts and

Animation to Animation and Game Design, Production: Radio/Audio to Audio Arts, Production: Television/Video to Cinematic Arts.

The second September UEPC meeting was held on September 30, 2025, with members Drs. Bu, Chiasson, Choiy, Padovani, Martin, Perry, and Remo present. The Undergraduate Student Vice President for Student Affairs, Abby Tate, was also present (8 out of 8 committee members present). Representatives from the Schools of Language and Linguistics, Agricultural Science, Anthropology, Political Science, and Sociology, and Art and Design attended the committee's meeting to answer any questions the UEPC members had about the schools' proposed RMEs. During this meeting, five RMEs were passed. They included the following: Rename Minor in Cinema, Rename B.S. and Minor in Crop, Soil, and Environmental Management to Agronomy, BA Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages, Minor in Applied Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management, and Rename Specialization and Minor in Art Education. These were all passed by the committee.

RME discussion:

K. Meksem stated the RMA for changing the name from Crop, Soil, and Environmental Management to Agronomy – can you explain why you're changing the name and where the handicaps that you and your colleagues are having? **Amir Sadeghpour** (Associate Prof. of Soil Mgmt. and Integrated Cropping Systems) stated the main reason for changing the name is for recruitment. The abbreviation of CSEM is pretty vague, and hard to explain. Agronomy is pretty clear; it's in line with what our faculty do. Also, give the students an experience that they deserve – ready for the job market. It will help us to be able to recruit students more easily, but also retain them. **K. Meksem** asked (Alan) Stewart Walters to explain about the greenhouse. **Alan Walters** (Professor of Vegetable Science and Breeding) stated the teaching greenhouse is part of the CSEM and HORT program – it's still in the works. We've been out of our greenhouse on campus for about 10 years, and we've been really trying to work to get this greenhouse to help with our recruitment. Both of the programs really have depended on this greenhouse that was built many years ago, and due to structural issues, it had to be torn down. Then we're waiting and that was in the year where we didn't have any funds from the state, so it was put on the program that year. But then COVID came and it's kind of just been several years before we got that. So, we are really struggling in both horticulture and agronomy for our students/instructional capabilities without a greenhouse. We grow plants, we take them in there to teach them - a lot of the horticulture classes are depending upon a greenhouse like floriculture. You can't grow flowers in the winter months without a greenhouse to instruct students. And in the spring, plant propagation and a couple of my classes I teach home gardening. We have that need for the greenhouse. I had a recruiter say a few years ago, if we had a greenhouse, we could increase enrollment in horticulture by 50%, and I believe that. When students come on campus, we don't have a greenhouse - we have to go off campus, which is a mile away; we lose time in class with transporting people. Also, horticulture is kind of special, because we are the only horticultural program in the entire state of Illinois. **K. Meksem** stated how many students do you have in your program that will benefit from the greenhouse? **Alan Walters** stated we have 50 right now, and we could increase it between 50-100% I'm certain if we had this greenhouse on campus. We can also envision this teaching greenhouse being an integral part of the campus as a showcase for our programs in the School of Forestry and Horticulture and Agricultural Sciences.

Motion: N. Roberts

Second: S. Lewison

A vote commenced: 27 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The RMEs listed above ("a-i") were approved as presented.

Quiet Week:

UEPC is currently reviewing the September draft of the Undergraduate Student Government's Quiet Week proposal brought to Faculty Senate via the Provost. The committee invited the Undergraduate Student President, Lydia Phelps, to present and discuss this proposal at our October 28th meeting. The goal of UEPC

is to have a supporting resolution for this proposal to the Faculty Senate during the November 18th meeting.

Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) Report:

UEPC is currently reviewing the report of the SIU Faculty Senate's (FS) Ad-Hoc Committee on addressing high DFW Rates and its associated recommendations. UEPC has been charged with developing a resolution indicating which of the DFW report's recommendations the FS will support. The SIU Faculty Senate's Ad-Hoc Committee on addressing high DFW rates would like UEPC and FS to consider developing six resolutions on the topics of 1.) active learning 2.) faculty training 3.) DFW data review 4.) course redesign support 5.) advising support and 6.) long-term accountability. The committee intends to begin our discussion of the DFW report's recommendations during our October 28th meeting; however, we do not expect to have a resolution to the full FS before December.

Instructor-Course Evaluations (ICE):

UEPC will be reviewing the report by the Ad-Hoc Committee on Instructor-Course Evaluations and its associated recommendations in November.

University Core Curriculum Changes:

UEPC will be reviewing the core curriculum changes proposed by UCC Director Jeffery Punske. These proposed changes are intended to bring SIU's core curriculum into alignment with the Higher Learning Commission's accreditation requirements and update the curriculum to integrate current best practices. UEPC will meet with Director Punske on October 30th to discuss these changes and develop a supporting resolution. It is the goal of UEPC to have a supporting resolution for the proposal to the Faculty Senate during the November 18th meeting.

D. Committee on Committees: Co-Chairs, Cheryl (Shelly) Page & Jonathan Remo

**1. Standing Committee Seats for (3) new Senators: UEPC – Kang Sun & Jenna Jamieson;
FSWC – Angela Shults**

S. Page stated Vice President Sherry sent to the Committee on Committees the names of three faculty members selected to replace the members who resigned over the summer. The Committee on Committees was tasked with signing them to Faculty Senate committees. The Committee on Committees chose to backfill the empty committee positions with three new Senators based on the committee's representation needs. Based on these needs, the Committee on Committees assigned Drs. Kang Sun, who is an assistant professor, and Jenna Jamieson, an associate lecturer, to the Undergraduate Education Policy Committee and Angela Schultz, who is an Assistant Professor of Practice to the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee. The Committee on Committees approved these appointments by a vote of seven-yes to zero-no. And the professors who voted were Drs. Bu, Page, Lewison, Apgar, Lee, Remo and Shamsi.

Motion: S. Page

Second: S. Lewison

A vote commenced: 28 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The standing committee seat appointments for Kang Sun (UEPC), Jenna Jamieson (UEPC), and Angela Shults (FSWC) were approved as presented.

E. Budget Committee: Chair, David M. Johnson

C. Wienke stated we met and the committee has been reviewing SIU's budget in comparison with that of our peer institutions as identified by the Provost, including Bowling Green State University, Western, Michigan, and a few others. Our analysis is focused on areas such as the percentage of the overall budget allocated to instruction and the proportion of employees who are faculty. We've been covering some findings that raise questions which we plan to discuss with the appropriate administrators before bringing them to the full Faculty Senate, since that setting is not ideal for examining detailed figures, and we anticipate having a more substantive update to share at the next Faculty Senate meeting. In addition, we hope to have a committee representative participating in the Chancellor's budget and planning meeting next Wednesday.

F. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee: Co-Chairs, Frances T. Lee & Gary Apgar

1. Faculty Emeritus Status Resolution

G. Apgar stated we'd like to revisit again the status policy and procedure for Emeriti faculty that has passed through our committee. I think that was one of the attachments with the meeting notes that came out earlier. Essentially we made a few grammatical changes, added a couple of words like tenure, and the effort of this is to try to define the protocol for being named Emeriti Faculty after retirement for either tenured, non-tenure track or distinguished administrators or senior administrators at the university to give them additional opportunities for engagement. We've had this for about a year to a year and a quarter to try and get this passed through.

J. Sherry stated thank you for adding the word "tenured." I think that helps for specificity. Did your committee get my email on the suggestion of removing the last paragraph? **G. Apgar** stated yeah, but I think that gives us some opportunity for someone who may not meet the 10-year minimum for service or what have you. It gives the opportunity for the conversation to happen. We've had committee members come up with guest lecturers and some invited expertise on campus and they wanted to confirm that there was at least an opportunity to name them as Emeriti at some point in the future. And in an effort to try to broaden it and not narrow it, we thought, well okay, that gives us maximum flexibility. **J. Sherry** stated I sent you a question that came from the Grad. Council about the Faculty Emeritus discussion. This was from Hale Yilmaz (Prof. of History) – she asked about the process of obtaining Emeriti Faculty status. It said the proposed Senate resolution requires a process involving application, nomination with letters, approval at multiple levels, including faculty vote at the unit level - it's such a lengthy process borrowed from other universities. What is the reason for requiring a vote at the unit level? It wasn't clear to the Educational Policies Committee if the unit is school or program. With a unit level vote of a faculty member who has served SIU for two, three or four decades, might be subject to a vote by a junior faculty who are new. Is the proposed policy intended to make it difficult for retiring faculty to acquire Emeriti status? We hope not. And that is what her committee sent to me. **G. Apgar** stated I'll open that up for the rest of the committee to discuss as well because - to be honest with you, Jennifer, I could change it again and that'll just make it another three or four more months. From my perspective, the Emeriti Status is a status. It shouldn't be open to everybody and there should be some opportunities for proving that level of status. I'd go down to the bottom of this where it doesn't limit a unit's ability to offer these or additional privileges to retired faculty. So, there's still an end around if that's a major concern. One can go directly to a unit's leader and probably end around this whole situation if they'd like to. So, I see this as much more comprehensively open than being restrictive.

Motion: C. Padovani

Second: S. Page

A vote commenced: 27 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The Faculty Emeritus Status resolution was approved as presented.

G. Governance Committee: Co-Chairs, Randall Auxier & Jun Qin

1. Reform & Modernization of Business Practices at SIU Resolution

R. Auxier stated we met on September 17, 2025, and 6 of the 8 committee members were there. We worked through two resolutions, one on "Quiet Week" which we messed with quite a bit, then voted on unanimously in favor of but now withdraw, because we agreed in our committee meeting that if the Provost changed her approach to this issue that we wouldn't need that resolution. And so, now we don't. The other one is the resolution that VC Susan Summers already addressed today, because in an Executive Committee meeting, the Chancellor asked for that resolution, even though it was still just a draft. And as you can see, is already acting on it. However, I do believe that we should make it an official resolution of the Faculty Senate, even though it's already being acted on. So, the committee - we inherited language on that from last year's Governance Committee and we approved it unanimously. We put it in front of the Senate today, and that is essentially the one about reworking the way that financial transactions are made

at the university. Evidently, we're getting a fair amount of agreement from the administration that, as a matter of fact, we are way, way behind the times. If you take a look at that, I don't see any point in reading it since they essentially, earlier in the meeting, went point by point down to what we were asking for and addressed all the points. **K. Meksem** stated we would like to vote on a document that will actually be sent by the Faculty Senate - request a reform and modernization of business practices here at SIU. You have seen actually what happened during the discussion; there's a complete disconnect. We need to update our forms; we need to update our business practices. There is no reason why somebody should travel and put \$1,000 on his or her credit card, wait three months, and pay interest on that money. There is no reason why a PI, a faculty member should actually suffer from filing a report with the agency that funded him, because his travel or his other expenses did not hit the system on time.

Motion: K. Meksem

Second: J. Jamieson

A vote commenced: 27 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The Reform & Modernization of Business Practices at SIU resolution was approved as presented.

H. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE: Lichang Wang

The FAC to IBHE meeting was held on September 19 at the UIUC, following my previous report at the FS meeting on September 9, 2025. Among the 12 four-year public universities in Illinois, SIUC is the only institution with flat enrollment; all others have reported increase, with Chicago State University seeing the highest growth at 17%. UIUC Presentations were delivered by the following individuals: Kevin Jackson, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; Kristi Kuntz, Executive Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Policies; Manny Rodriguez, Senior Assistant Director, Inclusive Teaching, Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning; and Eden Smothers, Project Manager for the Office of Online Learning. One particularly interesting initiative discussed was the development of a pilot program, the Dual Credit Learning Accelerator, which redesigns four Illinois General Education courses as dual credit offerings for 11th and 12th graders. Nora Heist, the IBHE Faculty board member from Eastern Illinois University, reported on the workforce dashboard and the direct admission program for HS students. Dave Tretter, President of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities, discussed issues currently facing private colleges and universities. Details of the meeting can be found at <http://www.facibhe.org/meetings/minutes.php>. On October 2, FAC to IBHE members were asked to nominate a representative from their institution to serve on the University Library & Professional Librarian Access & Transparency Task Force (SJR13) by October 16. I forwarded the request and asked Senate President Khalid Meksem to nominate a faculty member from SIUC. The next FAC IBHE meeting will take place on October 17, 2025, at Lake Land College. The November FAC IBHE meeting will be held on our campus on November 21 and I am actively planning various activities in preparation.

I. Graduate Council Representative: Kelly Bender

K. Bender stated we met on October 2nd and Provost Tucker went over the Low Producing Programs' Plan of Action, the same presentation I believe that she went over in Faculty Senate. Our representatives that are going to be involved in that review are from our Program Review Subcommittee that Ahmad Fakhoury is the Chair of. His group is going to be involved in helping review those programs. With the Emeritus Policy update, Jennifer brought up the question that our Educational Review Committee had, and I will make sure to communicate to them Gary's response to this. I hope we can have a resolution put together to vote on in our November meeting. Regarding RME updates - we voted to approve the name change and relocation of the Master of Fine Arts and Mass Communication and Media Arts to Media Arts in the School of Media Arts and our New Programs Subcommittee requested some additional information on establishing the Southern Illinois African American Heritage Center, as well as some more information on a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in AI for learning and training. The other thing that we accomplished for our Program Review Committee is approved reviewers for the Advanced Energy Institute, and we're working on updating policy on GA contract limits that are currently in place to try to increase those a bit.

VIII. Old Business

- Gaza statement / Resolution Against the Genocide of Palestinians in the Gaza Strip

K. Meksem stated this resolution has triggered a lot of discussions among the Senate and also in the Executive Committee. I would like us first to listen to Dr. Cinzia Padovani, and then we can proceed on how we can move on with this. **C. Padovani** stated this is the resolution we're asking. Palestinians in Gaza have endured large scale civilian casualties - widespread injury and mass displacement—now affecting roughly 90% of the population. Whereas, Gaza's educational infrastructure has been devastated, with the overwhelming majority of schools damaged or destroyed and all higher-education institutions struck, depriving hundreds of thousands of students of their right to education—an assault often termed scholasticide; and Whereas, freedom of information has been severely curtailed. We resolved that SIUC Faculty Senate condemns in particular the systematic destruction of educational institutions—scholasticide—including the killing of civilians, and attacks on schools and shelters. I would like to pass this resolution with the emphasis on a combination of scholasticide – a term that refers to the intentional and systematic destruction of an educational infrastructure of an entire people, including schools, universities, libraries and also the killing and detention of teachers and students. It's considered a form of cultural destruction. There are a number of university Senates that have passed resolutions.

K. Meksem stated do you want C. Padovani to fine tune this resolution with focus only on education or do you feel Senate should not be voting on something like this? Because I have lots of feedback from different people; some people were in favor, some people were not in favor. So, maybe we should start with, since everybody is here - if you feel that the Senate should actually be involved in such a resolution, I want you to raise your hand. When I'm talking about resolution, it's about education and cultural representations that's being destroyed in another place. While one hand was raised online and one in person, **N. Anaza** stated from an individual perspective, I think it's critically important that the Faculty Senate should take this up as an individual. But this was brought up in my school, and it wasn't favorably received. So, that's where I'm really torn. Am I speaking for myself or am I speaking as a representation of the school I belong to? For myself, I'm 100% in support of this; as a representation of my school, they are not in support of it. **S. Page** stated I also would add that there are a number of global crises going around the world and in those different crises there are educational institutions and academic freedoms that are being imposed upon, because of conflict that is taking place. When we make a stance on one issue, then what happens to the rest of the issues globally? And I think that the main thing that we should be doing as this institution, as our organization, is to advance teaching, research, and academic freedom, rather than foreign policy advocacy. And as horrible as I think what is happening in Gaza is, what about what's happening in Congo and Ukraine and Sudan? So, at what point do we say - ? **K. Meksem** stated do you prefer in this case to have a motion that would condemn anything that has to do with destroying education and culture everywhere in the world instead of focusing only on Gaza. **S. Page** stated I think that could be a solution. I just don't think that this is what we are supposed to be doing as an organization. And like the professor who spoke right before me, the law faculty was overwhelmingly against this - as a faculty, not individually. I don't think anybody is okay with what we are seeing happening in Gaza. Is that the job of the Faculty Senate to condemn this or to make a vote on this? That's where we're having a breakdown. **A. Torky** stated I'm a representative of Med School. So, representing my organization, I would say that I'm supporting this because there is a lot of literature on how this whole thing affected medicine and medication shortages. So, when I'm raising my hand, I'm not necessarily representing my opinion. I think this also reflects on the entire medical community, and there are lots of peer review literature that is supporting that this is an actual atrocity that people should take action against and condemn. So, I just wanted to clarify. **K. Meksem** stated I'm hearing actually here also an opinion that says if it's come to me, voting personally on something that concerns me, I am actually for it. If it comes to something that concerns the Senate, then I will vote no, because my school is against it. I think we will stop the discussion to next - it would be next month. "Next," whatever it is, when we have more information or when we have a group of people come in with this, then we might consider again. At the same time, I hear lots of the Senate should not be involved with this. I looked at our operating paper - there is nothing in our operating paper that says we should not vote on anything that we can bring to the Senate. So, I would like to send everybody to do their homework if they feel like this is something that has some merit. The good news is now there is peace. I don't know how long that peace is going to stand. The bad news is everything is destroyed. So, we don't know what's next for the Palestinian people – where they are going to get their education, their medical treatments. So, a lot of things are unknown. Therefore, I think we will just move

this to next with “next” being open. If everybody agrees, I would like you to raise your hand. K. Meksem stated a request was made – if this resolution has to resurface here on the Faculty Senate to make it really short and very specific.

Motion: n/a

Second: n/a

A vote commenced: 13 Yeas, 1 Nays, 8 Abstentions. It was approved to move the resolution to the next meeting. (Note: Per K. Meksem “next meeting” is undefined unless a group of faculty members bring this back to the Senate.)

Motion: K. Meksem

Second: J. Sherry

A vote commenced: 17 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. It was approved to *extend the meeting* time until 3:05 p.m.

IX. New Business

A. Faculty Senate operating paper vs. employee handbook (faculty ranks)

K. Meksem stated we sent everyone an email. As you can see, the operating paper does not reflect the definition of membership within the Faculty Senate. So, we are actually working on that. We had our first meeting with our upper administration, and they have a definition that has been present for the last eight years. The emailed document was referenced and held up while stating this is the definition we will be adopting from now on. So, this way when we're calling next for voting members for the Faculty Senate, we're going to call everybody that's listed on here.

B. Library Task Force Volunteer request – from FAC IBHE

K. Meksem stated the request was made by email. We need a volunteer to come forward. Please send me your name or send it to Melissa, Jennifer, or John.

X. Adjournment

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: J. Jamieson