

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**December 9, 2025**  
**Via MS Teams & Morris Library Room 754/752**  
**1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.**

**I. Call to Order: Khalid Meksem**

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

**II. Roll Call: John Farrish**

Present: Nwamaka Anaza, Gary Apgar, Randall Auxier, Lingguo Bu, Lavern Byfield, Christopher Chiasson, Kwangho Choiy, John Farrish, Erin Hascup, Ghassan Ishak, Jenna Jamieson, David M. Johnson, Seung-Hee Lee, Sarah Lewison, Jia Liu, Khalid Meksem, Cinzia Padovani, Shelly Page, Jun Qin, Jonathan Remo, Nicole Roberts, Mohtashim Shamsi, Jennifer Sherry, Kang Sun, Ahmed Torky, Cassie Wagner, Jennifer Walker, Haibo Wang, Christopher Wienke, Geoffrey Young

Absent: Erica Blumenstock (Proxy Samuel Perry), Timothy Hurley, Frances T. Lee, Katie Moore, Kaitlyn Poirier, Angela Shultz

Guests: Iraklis Anagnostopoulos, Jebaraj Asirvatham, Hong Cheng, Julie Dunston, Paul Frazier, Shelly Gehrke, Vjollca Konjufca, Melissa Laake, Austin Lane, Liliana Lefticariu, Irene Miller, Kimberli Morgan, Robert Morgan, Marc Morris, Jeffrey Punske, David Shirley, Susan Simmers, Constantinos Tsatsoulis, Sheryl Tucker, Juliane Wallace, Lichang Wang

**III. Approval of Minutes from November 18, 2025**

Motion: J. Remo

Second: J. Sherry

A vote commenced: 24 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The minutes from November 18, 2025, were approved as presented.

**IV. President's Report: Khalid Meksem**

**A. Promotion & Tenure Policies *Ad Hoc* Committee**

**B. Teaching Effectiveness *Ad Hoc* Committee**

K. Meksem asked for a formal charge from the Provost for *both ad hoc committees*.

**C. Charges for new *Ad Hoc* Committees**

**1. Business Practice Committee**

K. Meksem stated the reason why we have the Business Practice Ad Hoc Committee is to be able to identify the malfunction within the system when it comes to business practices, finances, and accounting. The goal is to help our current administrators to see what is needed, to buy new software or new ways that we can make life easy for everybody. *(There were no questions/discussion from Senate regarding the draft resolution/charge.)*

Motion: K. Meksem

Second: C. Page

A vote commenced: 26 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The resolution/charge for the Business Practice Ad Hoc Committee was approved as presented.

**2. Global Engagement Committee**

K. Meksem stated as you all know, international students have been very important to not only our university, but most universities in the US. They are actually contributing to our R1 status and our diversity here at the university. The charge has been shared via email, and today we will vote on it. This way we can all be engaged with our international students from recruiting to making their life easier at SIU, to actually pointing them to the right person if they need anything or to open your door

and talk to them. *(There was no discussion or question from Senate regarding the draft resolution/charge.)*

Motion: G. Young

Second: K. Meksem

A vote commenced: 25 Yeas, 1 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The resolution/charge for the Global Engagement Ad Hoc Committee was approved as presented.

**V. Vice President's Report: Jennifer Sherry**

**A. COLA Dean Search Committee: FS rep is David M. Johnson**

Faculty Senate Executive Council voted on the representative for the Dean Search committee for COLA, and David M. Johnson was selected as a representative. I would like to thank Christopher Wienke and Katie Moore for submitting information for this important position as well. Thank you very much.

**B. Results from faculty at large vote: Changes in "faculty" definition for the Faculty Senate operating paper**

We included all faculty, including the School of Medicine, and we had 127 Yea, 10 Nay, 10 Abstentions. A total of 147 voted; the changes to the "faculty" definition in the Faculty Senate operating paper has been approved.

- a. [...faculty shall consist of all ~~appointees to the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor, associate instructor, assistant instructor, instructor, senior lecturer, associate lecturer, assistant lecturer, and lecturer in academic units~~ **faculty** appointees **as tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track with at least 50% appointment through the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor or the School of Medicine**. Research, visiting, adjunct, and clinical categories holding the above-mentioned ranks in academic units (college, department, or school level) shall also be considered faculty, providing faculty bearing those titles hold at least a 50% appointment through the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor or the School of Medicine. Those who were members of the faculty at the time of the referendum of this definition shall not be subsequently disenfranchised by this definition. Faculty members enrolled in a degree program in the department in which they hold academic rank shall not be considered faculty. Any faculty member holding at least a 51% administrative appointment, (including those holding the title of chair, director, or above, whether interim or permanent) are not considered faculty for purposes of membership on the Faculty Senate by the time their administrative appointment begins.]

**VI. Invited Guests:**

**A. Chancellor Lane**

Welcome to finals week. I appreciate all that you have done this semester; it's gone fast. I want to highlight our retirees and folks that were recognized for service awards (up to 35 yrs. of service). A lot of your colleagues are to be commended for their years of service. So, if you get a chance to, congratulate them. You just heard the committees that Dr. Meksem put forward. We're very appreciative of you working with us to continue to enhance what we have at the university. We welcome the feedback and the work the committees are going to do. Our folks are in constant mode of trying to upgrade or enhance several things; we've been doing that over the last several years. It does take a team effort, so any assistance, expertise or guidance, we're all ears and fully supportive of the work that we're going to do together. I just want to say that in advance for my team. Happy Holidays, and I hope to see you at commencement on Saturday.

**B. Provost Tucker**

Just a few reminders - The Center for Teaching Excellence, or CTE, sent out an email. I think Faculty Senate sent it out. It went through colleges and school directors. Faculty definitely need to look at that. One of the main points is D2L Brightspace Course and Activation and Deletion Policy. If you recall, we are way over our storage limit, because we have not actively monitored courses that are no longer

taught within the system. They just sort of hang out there as inactive. So, that will happen. As people have time next week after you get grades in, etc., if that involves you, you may need to download some of your old materials if you want to keep them that are inactive. Speaking of grades, I would love to see us at 100% for grades being turned in on time next week. We did have, not last year, but the year before, College of Business and Analytics hit 100% for their entire college. So, please help us do that. It allows us to go ahead and get those degree clearances and degrees posted for our students. On the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion and Tenure, Dr. Wallace and I are working on that charge. If you are aware of any concerns/issues, please let us know so we can make sure they are highlighted in that charge to that committee. That would be very helpful to have a broad-based view on that. I want to just express appreciation for all the resolutions you're considering from the DFW report. That was an extraordinary report. A lot of scientific data there that was collected and analyzed, and I appreciate the action that you may take today on those resolutions. I've seen the preliminary report - thank you to Dr. Remo and his committee on Priority Program Review. I know they have some questions, and I'm happy to answer. After commencement, I do hope that you get time away from work to spend with family and friends over the holiday season. Thank you.

**C. Chief of Staff David Shirley & VC Paul Frazier (Retention Retreat)**

**CoS D. Shirley** shared a PowerPoint presentation titled, "2025 Retention Retreat Recap." The Retention Retreat was on November 19, 2025. (The percentages shown in parentheses below are what we need to make up by 2030. Below are the 2030 goals.)

**90% Fall to Spring** (+5.8%)

**80% Fall to Fall** (+13.3%)

**55% 4yr Grad** (+13.6%)

**61% 6yr Grad** (+2.5%)

Within those gaps, we are also seeing some performance gaps across unique demographics. Those are our ethnicities, first generation or Pell students and several other groups. And one of the questions that we've been pondering and trying to strategize around is what's an opportunity that we have to really program for some students ways to close some of those gaps? We determined that high school GPA under 2.75 would be a great group to start working with, and so, that group is well represented for those other factors that students come with that would also contribute to lower retention and graduation rates. And as we dug further, we can see that those gaps for the students coming in with the high school GPA under 2.75 retained significant gaps for our retention rates and as well as for our graduation rates. You can see the differences here are pretty broad. And so, with that we devised a new model. **VC Frazier** stated during our retreat, we talked about a new collaborative model which we presented, and that is going to require all of our faculty and all of our departments across campus. I just briefly want to touch on some of our key strategies we hope to encompass to help our students that are below 2.75 and not just isolated to those students that are in the SSI program, but students across colleges. Some high touch support would initially start out of our offices and with their advisors and also holistic support - so not just some academic pieces, some of the social pieces and mental health pieces as well that would come out of the SMRC. What we hope to create is some long-term relationships that can be attributed to our retention numbers growing. Also coming out of SMRC is some of the cultural responsive engagement through some of the events, but those students that are below a 2.75 also come to campus with a contract and some of these events they are required to do (tutoring and some of the engagement pieces). And strength-based and validating where students need to be and being proactive and not reactive in some of that. And then assessing what their needs are early on and if there are deficits or students are deemed to have other issues like not coming to class and not academically sound, we'll know that early on, long before the 10th week. So, we'll see those reports in the 4<sup>th</sup>, 8th, and the 12th week as well. But that only happens if faculty initiate that and put that in Slate.

**D. VCR/Dean of Graduate School: Costas Tsatsoulis**

**VCR Tsatsoulis** stated I have enjoyed working with the Faculty Senate this semester. I've always enjoyed working with our colleagues. I hope to see all of you at the commencement ceremony on Saturday. I would like to show my appreciation to all the units that have done a great job in clearing up our applications for spring 2026. I know that this is a lot of hard work. I know that you're all working to tell us what is a completed application to edit these things. We're down to about 60 students, but I don't

really count a lot of them, because some of them have been applying this week. So, they don't really expect the response that fast. We probably will defer a lot of them for the fall, but it's been a great job by every unit, every program, all the faculty and faculty committees, the directors of graduate studies and so on. I hope you see all of you during the celebration that we have at commencement. You may have noticed that some of these graduating students have 10, 12, 15 of their family there celebrating with us, and that's because it's a momentous occasion for them. It is something that changes not just the trajectory of themselves, but of their whole families. So, please try to be there and celebrate with our students.

**E. "Quiet Week" Proposal Update: Senator Jonathan Remo**

The UEPC has worked all semester on the "Quiet Week" proposal. We met with the undergraduate constituency. We've discussed the policy with them and then upon working with the Provost Office on the wording, at the end of the day, the UEPC voted not to support the resolution for the "Quiet Week" proposal. The result of the vote was three yes, four no, and three abstentions. So, it did not move forward to the full Faculty Senate. The consensus among the committee members was that the "Quiet Week" proposal didn't address the core concern of the undergraduate constituency, which was primarily that faculty turn their grades in on time. And the secondary was concerns about academic freedom related to different components or perceived academic freedom issues with the "Quiet Week" proposal.

**F. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE: Lichang Wang**

The FAC to IBHE meeting convened on our campus on November 21, 2025. IBHE Assistant Director of Academic Affairs Jill Gebke reported the results of the Early Attendance reports statewide, highlighting gains in overall enrollment and dual-credit participation. She noted that African American enrollment increased, although the state saw a 5.2% decline in international students. Retention rates also improved, offering a positive snapshot of current trends. Growth was observed across undergraduate sectors, including public, private, and community colleges—while credential programs increased by 1%–3%. On the Illinois Public University enrollment: Total enrollment increased by 2.3% (+4,214 students) to 189,791 – the highest number since 2015. This growth was driven entirely by undergraduates, as graduate/professional enrollment saw a slight decline.

- **Strong Undergraduate Increase:** The undergraduate population grew by 3.8% (+4,859 students). This growth was seen across all student types, including a 6.8% increase in first-time, full-time freshmen, a 6.5% increase in new full-time transfers, and a significant 18.1% jump in dual credit/dually enrolled students.
- **Significant Gains for Underrepresented Students:** Enrollment for African American and Latino students saw large increases. Total African American enrollment grew by 9.7% (+2,039 students), and total Latino enrollment grew by 8.3% (+2,491 students).
- **Drop in International Graduate Students:** While undergraduate international enrollment grew by 3.0%, this was overshadowed by a large 14.1% decrease in graduate/professional international students (-2,178 students). This led to an overall 6.5% decline in total international student enrollment.
- **Retention Rate Improvement:** The overall fall-to-fall retention rate for freshmen improved, rising to 82.7%. Retention gaps for underrepresented students narrowed; the gap between African American (65.1%) and White (87.5%) students closed by 3.0 percentage points, and the gap between Latino (80.0%) and White students closed by 4.0 percentage points.

In the morning, the VCR and Dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Costas Tastsoulis, shared the story of SIUC's transition from an R2 institution to an R1 and also emphasized SIUC as an opportunity institution. Additionally, he highlighted programs such as Pell Grants that expand access for minority students, noting that SIUC is one of only 20 schools nationwide to pair R1 status with accessibility initiatives such as Pell Grant eligibility. In the afternoon, Chancellor Austin Lane welcomed attendees to SIUC and invited everyone to briefly reintroduce themselves. He expressed his appreciation for community

colleges and the vital role their transfer programs play. Chancellor Lane discussed the budget impasse during the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on both the university and the state, noting that SIUC rebounded largely due to the service and dedication of numerous academic professionals. He highlighted ongoing efforts to increase enrollment and expand recruitment beyond Illinois. Chancellor Lane also reported a 23% increase in online enrollment, emphasizing a growing focus on non-traditional students. He reiterated the institution's transition from an R2 to an R1 university and the benefits that change has brought. Finally, he spoke about the Saluki Step Ahead program, designed to strengthen pathways between community colleges and SIUC. The working groups and caucuses worked on the issues at hand and reported their findings at the end of the meeting. Details of the meeting can be found at <http://www.facibhe.org/meetings/minutes.php>. The next FAC IBHE meeting will take place on December 19, 2025, via Zoom. \* A special thanks to Chancellor Lane, VCR Tsatsoulis, Jodi Boese, Sarah Vanvooren, Courtney Howell, Michelle Odem, and Kim Goforth for helping with the meeting.

**G. Graduate Council Chair: Kelly Bender** - (report was given to Senators prior to the meeting)

- A call for faculty proposals for Teaching Assistant (graduate student) support for innovative educational endeavors will be going out soon with a deadline of February 2<sup>nd</sup>.
- Passage of a Resolution in support of RME to eliminate the Master of Engineering (M.E.) in Biomedical Engineering offered in the School of Electrical, Computer, and Biomedical Engineering within the College of Engineering, Computing, Technology, and Mathematics.
- Passage of Resolution in support of RME to Establish the Southern Illinois African American Heritage Center (SIAAHC) with temporary status in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research.

Note: **K. Meksem** stated I would like to inform everybody who's participating in those meetings, please send your report to M. Laake to share with Senators and then present the most important thing from your report. That's a change that's going to take effect starting in February.

**H. Q & A**

**D. M. Johnson** stated I appreciate how much work has gone into that (data on retention) - How does our incoming high school GPA compare to that of our peers? **Chancellor Lane** and D. Shirley did not have that comparison data but thought it was 3.2 for our incoming students. We can get that information.

**K. Meksem** stated to VCR Tsatsoulis - On the website for faculty travel support there is an email address. When faculty submit travel requests, they don't receive confirmation that an email has been received. VCR Tsatsoulis stated we will make sure that faculty do receive a response that their application has been received, and we'll make an effort to do that as quickly as feasible given our staffing.

**R. Auxier** stated when you are registering for international travel, there is a place where you have to check if you're taking a university computer to a forbidden country. If you're not taking a university computer, there's no way to move forward, because it requires you to ask for a clean computer. There's no way to complete the process. But right at the moment, I have to ask for a computer I don't need in order to finish the process. I would like an opt out if you're not taking a university computer to Iran, China, North Korea, etc. **Provost Tucker** asked R. Auxier to send her an email so she can forward it to system. That's SIU System that handles international travel, the website, and everything.

**M. Shamsi** asked about international students being offered admissions without financial support. **VCR Tsatsoulis** stated the students are supposed to in order to get an I-20 to provide information about the financial status and their ability to pay the expenses for the first year of their studies. They do that not only through financial support of the university, but also through financial support of other sources. We support about 800-850 of our graduate students. We have about 2,800. So, about 2,000 of our graduate students receive no financial support from the university. Graduate admissions are 100% governed by the faculty of a school or a unit and the college, and we accept that reality. We're here to support your decisions. If you believe that you should admit students with financial support, we will support that as well. Well, the only thing that we're suggesting is that sometimes you may want to admit a student and

consider financial support later, because early admission gives the possibility of you getting the student, while a late admission may not. So, definitely support the students, but you may want to separate admission from support.

**J. Jamieson** stated we discussed travel reimbursement in the October or November meeting. We discussed the timeline for reimbursement. I'm just wondering if we have update on that, because I just finished reimbursement for a trip that took over two months to get reimbursed and all that money was fronted out of my pocket. I don't want to blame any certain entity, but it is hard to front load that much money for conferences when we're doing presentations and research on behalf of the university. It would just be helpful to have an update on reimbursements expected, because there's bills and things that have to be paid. **K. Meksem** stated in the past, we used to be able to get an advance from the university. People could go on their travel, come back, submit their travel voucher, and this way they don't have to worry about the time. They didn't put it on a credit card with an interest rate of 25%. They will have to pay more by the time they get reimbursed. **D. Shirley** stated VC Susan Simmers has been working with her staff to establish training dates, and those should already be started to at least help smooth out the initial process by providing somewhat of a checklist for folks to work through. The strategy is that through those trainings we'll be able to help shorten that timeline by making the communication process clearer. Now on the other hand, they're also working with IT to develop an entirely new process that will use Power Apps to help us not only manage the flow but also help us be able to audit those travel vouchers. So, as things are going through, we'll be able to see if there's a hang up where it is stuck in the process. That is taking some time to develop, but hopefully in the meantime those trainings will help as well. **Chancellor Lane** asked J. Jamieson to send her information to D. Shirley to make sure she gets reimbursed. **E. Hascup** stated she had to wait six months to get reimbursed for a conference that she went to. **Chancellor Lane** stated when travel vouchers are sent, you should get something back within two weeks; that's the goal, that is if there are no errors. **J. Sherry** stated I have a comment to the Graduate School. I was one of those who took advantage of the funding for a conference, and I received my financials before the month was out. So, thank you very much for that support and for expeditiously reimbursing me. **VCR Tsatsoulis** stated thank you; I appreciate that. And just to make sure, the Graduate School supports graduate students. It is the office of the VCR that supports faculty. So together, we have given more than \$80,000 last year to support presentations and conferences of the research of our students and faculty.

**K. Meksem** asked if it's true that all schools and colleges submitted their operating papers (OP). **Provost Tucker** stated no, it's not true. APAA Juliane Wallace stated we are very close. There are a couple of colleges that we're still working with the new Deans and there are a couple of schools that we're working with the FA and one school that we're very close. I'm hoping to approve it soon. And then one school that really needs some work yet that we're working with. So, we're down to about 5, I believe. **K. Meksem** stated the OP calls for actually new organizations – new directors should be appointed to follow the new OP. **Provost Tucker** stated I would not agree with that. There was never any intent that we would wholesale dismiss all our School Directors and make them reapply because of the operating paper. **K. Meksem** stated most operating papers actually have listed a time frame for the School Director when they're going to be serving before they get reviewed. So, that has not been followed yet. **Provost Tucker** stated we can make sure Deans are paying attention to those.

**K. Meksem** stated most of the Deans have not presented to their faculty their five-year plan. How is your office going to reinforce the policy of every college of having a plan? The reason why most faculty are not really engaged with their Deans is because they don't see their deans; they don't hold meetings. When there is no plan, people are disengaged. **Provost Tucker** stated remember we hired four new Deans; they're not going to come in with a plan. They're going to develop a shared vision for your college going forward. A lot of Deans are working on a strategic plan. **V. Konjufca** stated from the perspective of a faculty, I share the concern that K. Meksem brought up, because it's very important that our new leaders meet us. When they start off, get our point of view and our challenges, and see how to work together. I think that will go a long way in making a strategic plan as well. Very often

faculty feel non-existent and disconnected. **Chancellor Lane** asked the Deans how they engage their faculty. **Dean M. Morris** stated when I first started, I met with each faculty and staff member in their office, their comfort zone. I wanted to hear the good, bad, and the ugly of what they thought of the college/school/dept./programs and how we can help make it better together. The following spring meeting I presented what I heard from them all. In the fall meeting, suggestions were made on how we can go forward together. We have a Strategic Planning Committee made up of a couple of external people, but certainly internal faculty and staff. We hope to have a strategic plan in place covering the next five years by our spring meeting. **Dean R. Morgan** stated it's critical that we hear from faculty. The faculty feedback is instrumental in terms of what we do in the College of Health and Human Sciences. We have an annual meeting where the Dean and Dean's Office present the challenges we're dealing with and the goals and aspirations we have set for the year. There is an opportunity to receive questions and feedback on our plans and what we're working on. I make it a point to attend a faculty meeting in every school or program at least once a year, again to hear from faculty. I encourage the Directors to reach out and let me know when my presence at a meeting would be helpful. **Dean H. Cheng** from the College of Arts and Media stated my first summer here, I tried to meet with as many CAM colleagues as possible who were available on campus at that time. I met all School Directors and all the other people working in the college. I met each of them at that time. Another way I stay in touch with our colleges, faculty and staff is through the annual college assembly at the beginning of each academic year. Starting last year, in the spring semester, we have a Dean's meeting with faculty to give them updates about where we are and answer the colleges' councils of questions. Since last year, this newly organized college has a CAM Council that includes tenured, non-tenure track faculty, staff, and student representatives. I attended their meetings upon their invitation periodically as well, since last year. CAM is very active with events; we have a lot of performances like concerts, theater, and exhibitions. Our School of Music has more than 100 shows a year. Very often I receive an invitation from our faculty and the students, and I do my very best to attend as many as possible. And at the beginning of each academic year, I made it clear to our management council, especially all our School Directors, that I would love to attend your school's faculty meeting and please build me in into your schedule. I received the invitation from some of the schools, but not all. From what I heard today, I will give all my School Directors a reminder. Probably I will more proactively schedule meetings with those schools who didn't extend the invitation to me. And it sounds like they didn't need me to be there, but some School Directors did need me. **S. Page** stated I feel comfortable saying on behalf of the Dean of Law School that she has met with every faculty member. She just started in July and had a meeting with the tenure track faculty. She attends every faculty meeting we have had. We do have a strategic plan in place. I am on a committee that's working on a certain section of the strategic plan, which is supposed to be polished in the spring. So, I just wanted to say at the Law School, our Dean is doing a fabulous job. **S. Lewison** stated we do have communication problems in our college, respectfully between the faculty and the Dean, at least in our school (due to the reorganization). **K. Meksem** stated I would like to thank Dr. Lewison for her service on Senate. She's retiring and I wish her good luck. You have been very helpful and thank you for your contributions.

**VC Susan Simmers** gave an update on travel vouchers/reimbursement per Chancellor's request. Four classes were held on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, and 19<sup>th</sup> for two hours each in the library. We had about 35 in attendance per class. We want to do another training session that is just for the travelers. It was discussed to have a subgroup from Faculty Senate to work with us to look at our training materials. We're updating materials to be ready for the website. We got a lot of feedback from the training sessions. VC Simmers did confirm that School of Medicine does their own travel and requested Senator Jenna Jamieson to email her regarding her travel information due to delayed reimbursement.

## **VII. Reports**

### **A. Executive Committee: Chair, Khalid Meksem**

**K. Meksem** stated I would like to thank you for representing your colleagues, your schools and colleges. It's very important to remember the responsibility that was assigned to you by your colleagues when they sent you to Senate.

**B. Election Committee: Chair, Jennifer Sherry**

**1. JRB Election – (an electronic link was sent via email during the meeting)**

**J. Sherry** asked for a motion and second to move forward with the JRB electronic voting.

Motion: J. Remo

Second: K. Meksem

The Judicial Review Board election took place during the meeting. The **new Judicial Review Board members** for the Fall 2025 election have been approved as presented. Elected Members are Terry Clark – COBA; Liliana Lefticariu – CALPS (2<sup>nd</sup> term); Cheng-Yao Lin – SOE; Getahun Benti – COLA (2<sup>nd</sup> term).

**C. Judicial Review Board: Chair, Liliana Lefticariu**

**1. Annual Report**

I was nominated to be Chair of the Judicial Review Board on 8/13/2025, and the Faculty Senate approved my nomination at the Faculty Senate meeting on 9/9/2025. Therefore, this report covers the Judicial Review Board activities for the 2025 fall semester. The JRB consists of 11 members, from whom a chair, vice-chair, and secretary are elected. During the fall semester of 2025, the committee had 10 active members, with one seat in the College of Agricultural, Life, & Physical Sciences vacant. Dr James Conder, from the School of Earth Systems and Sustainability, previously held the seat as the Chair of the JRB and stepped down to take an administrative position. The ten active members of the JRB are Liliana Lefticariu, \**Lingguo Bu*, Getahun Benti, \**David Sutton*, Mary Taylor, Taeho Yoh, Seung-Hee Lee, Cindy Buys, Asghar Esmaeeli, and Sukesh Bhaumik. (\*See VII., B., 1 for new JRB members.)

Summary of activity:

During the 2025 fall semester, no grievance case was referred to the JRB. However, the JRB has received multiple inquiries regarding procedural matters from faculty seeking to file a grievance and from administrators handling a faculty grievance. In each case, after consultation between the Chair and the Vice Chair of the JRB and additional legal guidance from the Provost's Office, we were able to provide advice on the best course of action.

**D. Undergraduate Education Policy Committee: Chair Jonathan Remo**

The Undergraduate Education Policy Committee (UEPC) met on November 18<sup>th</sup> to pass five supporting resolutions for Reasonable and Moderate Extensions (RMEs), six supporting resolutions on the recommendations pertaining to Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations addressing high D, F, withdraw (DFW) rates, and finalizing our decision on the "Quiet Week" resolution. Committee members in attendance included Drs. Chiasson, Choiy, Jamieson, Martin, Remo, Sun, and Undergraduate Student VP Abby Tate (7 of 10 members).

**1. RMEs:**

- a. RME Minor AI in Creative Fields**
- b. RME Move Art History from School of Art & Design to School of History & Philosophy**
- c. RME Minor Aviation Human Factors**
- d. RME Rename Minor East Asian Civilization**
- e. RME UG Certificate of Multiliteracy**

The UEPC received five RMEs from the office of Associate Provost for Academic Programs (APAP). The UEPC invited representatives from each of the academic units to briefly present and answer questions about their RMEs (see table below).

Description	Presenters
RME to Move Art History Programs from School of Art and Design to School of History and Philosophy	Director Jonathan Bean and Professor Laurel Fredrickson (Art History)

RME for Minor Aviation Human Factors	Dr. Irene Miller (School of Aviation)
<i>RME for Minor AI in Creative Fields</i>	Dean Hong Cheng (College of Art and Media) and Professor Aaron Scott (School of Art and Design)
RME to Rename Minor East Asian Civilization	Professor Shu-Ling Wu (School of Languages and Linguistics)
RME for Undergraduate Certificate of Multiliteracy	Dr. Katherine Martin (School of Languages and Linguistics)

The UEPC voted unanimously to pass these five supporting resolutions for these RMEs.

Vote for (5) RMEs:

Motion: K. Meksem

Second: J. Farrish

Discussion took place for the RME Minor AI in Creative Fields. C. Wienke shared concerns with the inclusion of AI in the curriculum for freshman and sophomores in particular. They don't have a strong foundation in critical thinking, research skills, and creative thinking. (Dean Hong Cheng was not available for questions.)

Motion: R. Auxier

Second: D. M. Johnson

A vote commenced: 25 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. Senate agreed to *table* the (1) RME for the next Faculty Senate meeting (*RME Minor AI in Creative Fields*).

Motion: K. Meksem

Second: J. Sherry

A vote commenced: 25 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The following (4) RMEs were approved as presented: *RME to Move Art History Programs from School of Art and Design to School of History and Philosophy*; *RME for Minor Aviation Human Factors*; *RME to Rename Minor East Asian Civilization*; and *RME for Undergraduate Certificate of Multiliteracy*.

## 2. Resolutions for the DFW Report Recommendations

- a. Resolution in Support of the Active Learning Strategy for Reducing DFW Rates
- b. Resolution in Support of the Review of DFW Data on a Regular Basis
- c. Resolution for Advising Support
- d. Resolution in Support of Faculty Training on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Inclusive Course Design to Reduce DFW Rates
- e. Resolution in Support of Redesign Assistance for Courses with High DFW Rates
- f. Resolution in Support of Long-Term Accountability for the Reduction of DFW Rates

The committee reviewed six supporting resolutions on the recommendations put forth by the Faculty Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on addressing high DFW rates. The UEPC unanimously passed all six of these supporting resolutions (a-f. listed above).

Motion: K. Meksem

Second: C. Page

A vote commenced: 24 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The above listed Resolutions (a.– f.) for the DFW Report Recommendations were approved as presented.

## 3. Update on Low Producing Programs Committee (n/k/a Priority Review Programs Committee [PRPC])

The Priority Review Program Committee (PRPC), formally known as the Low Producing Programs Committee, met on December 3, 2025, to review and recommend changes to the Provost

Office's program evaluation rubric, also referred to the program viability rubric. After reviewing the proposed criteria, the PRPC recommends keeping one of the 13 original criteria, modifying 3 criteria, adding 2 new criteria, and removing 9 criteria. Table 1 summarizes these criteria, which has been shared with you in an e-mail. Additionally, the PRPC recommends reducing the evaluation categories from three to two. Originally, there were below expectations, meet expectations, and exceeds expectations. The committee recommends only having two: Below Expectations and Near or Meets Expectations. The aim here was to streamline the evaluation process. The committee also noted that the usefulness of "degrees conferred" and "enrollment" criteria was unclear, because the program listed on the Illinois Board of Education's Academic Program Efficiency and Effectiveness Report already fails to meet expectations for both. To address this, the qualifier "near expectations" is proposed to distinguish programs that are significantly below expectations from those closer to meeting them. The committee also had two asks of the Provost Office. The first ask was when the PRPC compared the 2024 IBHE APEERS List to the undergraduate Low Producing Programs list prepared by the Provost Office in March 2025. The 2024 IBHE APEERS List had only 6 undergraduate programs identified as Priority Review Programs, where the Provost Office list had 32 undergraduate programs identified as meeting the APEERS criteria for low producing programs. The committee would greatly appreciate an explanation of the process of how low producing programs are submitted to IBHE for the APEERS review. Why is there such a large difference between the APEERS report and SIU internal numbers for the Priority Review Programs' list? This question will probably be answered today or at a future meeting. The PRPC also seeks clarification on what the Provost Office intends to do with any undergraduate program recommended for sunset. According to the IBHE APEERS guidelines, any programs slated for sunset must include a teach out period allowing current enrolled students to complete their degrees while suspending new admissions. However, the Provost's charge to the PRPC does not specifically say what happens after the teach-out period ends. Is it simply the intent to discontinue the undergraduate program while keeping the school or department active to support the undergraduate core curriculum or does the Provost Office have another plan?

**K. Meksem** stated to Provost Tucker on behalf of my faculty here, I request instead of Low Producing Program – which sends a very negative wave to faculty – to change it to Priority Review Programs. Provost Tucker stated no issue.

**H. Wang** asked to have a note added to the Excel sheet stating the biomedical engineering program that launched in fall 2020 received the ABET accreditation in 2025.

#### **E. Budget Committee: Chair, David M. Johnson**

We are continuing to look into the question that is one of the drivers behind the move to scrutinize academic programs on campus: is our student-faculty ratio sustainable? Or does SIUC have too many faculty? We have done some looking at comparative data for SIUC and our peers via the IPEDS database. David Shirley, head of institutional research and Chief of Staff, has provided some helpful data. The data we've seen confirms that our student-faculty ratio is considerably lower than that of our peers. On the other hand, faculty make up a similar percentage of SIUC employees as faculty do at our peers, suggesting faculty numbers are not out of alignment. And the percentage of our expenditures devoted to instruction is actually considerably lower than that of our peers. So, we have something of a mystery, as by one criterion we appear to have more faculty than our student body needs, whereas by another we seem to have the right proportion of faculty and by still another, we appear to spend too little of our money on instruction. One thing we've yet to try to figure out is whether overall expenditure on faculty is in line with what we'd expect from peers. That is, whether faculty salaries play a similar role in our budget that they do with peers. The faculty salary study will provide more information on this, and from what I've seen, it will confirm that we are underpaid, but we'll also try to look at this more carefully. It's possible, for example, that we have plenty of faculty, given the size of our student body, but don't pay them enough. The data isn't easy to analyze, as no two peers are equivalent and university budgets are complex. We are continuing to work with administrative partners to get to the bottom of the basic question we're asking: Does our budget reflect the importance of

faculty to our mission? We hope to have some sort of answer to that question, even if it is tentative, before the end of the spring semester.

**F. Committee on Committees: Co-Chairs, Cheryl (Shelly) Page & Jonathan Remo – (no report)**

**G. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee: Co-Chairs, Frances T. Lee & Gary Apgar – (no report)**

**K. Meksem** stated there was a concern about this committee in Executive Council. An email was sent to the committee Co-Chairs, Frances T. Lee & Gary Apgar, requesting them to ask their committee who would like to volunteer to be the Chair or Co-Chairs since they have not showed for several meetings. There was no response. **K. Meksem** asked during the meeting for the committee members to state their names and to organize a meeting. **V. Konjufca** volunteered to Chair the meeting. *He asked for the resignation of the current Co-Chairs.*

**H. Governance Committee: Co-Chairs, Randall Auxier & Jun Qin – Committee did not meet.**

We reviewed all that **J. Remo** is doing to make sure we didn't see any issues and we didn't.

**VIII. Old Business – (none)**

**IX. New Business**

- **K. Meksem** suggested getting release time for the Vice President's role (**Jennifer Sherry**). A lot of time is committed to this role and therefore, I would like the Senate to consider forming a resolution to ask the Provost for release time (at least 3 hrs.) for the Vice President of the Senate.

Motion: **K. Meksem**

Second: **R. Auxier**

**N. Anaza** stated last year was the first year the President (**Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee**) received release time. This is considered service, and most people don't get time off for service. How do we make that case for the service we are doing? **K. Meksem** stated reality hits you that you are providing more of your time to serve on Senate and that's why we need to do that. There is no reason why faculty should work for free; nobody works for free. Any service you provide for free is never appreciated. **J. Sherry** stated I would comment that we need to probably back up and talk to the Provost about this. **D. M. Johnson** stated another person doing a lot of work is **J. Remo**. I think there may be a workload issue in terms of how we organize the Senate. Maybe this is something for **R. Auxier's** committee (Governance Committee) to consider in terms of whether certain committees or certain positions are given too much work. **R. Auxier** stated one thing we could do in the Governance Committee is work up a resolution that says when you're elected to the Faculty Senate, a notice goes to whoever your director is, or whoever fills out your assignment of duties that you will have heavier service than just regular department service. You will have university level service associated with that and the adjustment to the assignment of duty are either recommended - or if we wanted to get serious about it we can go through a more serious process of recommending that operating papers for each unit take into account Faculty Senate as service. **K. Meksem** gave the charge (referred) to the Governance Committee to establish a scale of release time or percentage of service to be reported to the units of every Senator who's serving in Senate – to form a resolution. **R. Auxier** stated it's a Governance issue due to the resolution is aimed at a revision of every operating paper.

**X. Adjournment**

Motion: **J. Remo**

Second: **J. Sherry**