

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 14, 2026
Via MS Teams & Morris Library Room 754
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order: Khalid Meksem

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

II. Roll Call: John Farrish (M. Laake & J. Sherry)

Present: Nwamaka Anaza, Erica Blumenstock, Lingguo Bu, Lavern Byfield, Christopher Chiasson, Kwangho Choij, Laurel Fredrickson, Erin Hascup, Timothy Hurley, Ghassan Ishak, Jenna Jamieson, David M. Johnson, Seung-Hee Lee, Jia Liu, Khalid Meksem, Katie Moore, Cinzia Padovani, Shelly Page, Kaitlyn Poirier, Jun Qin, Nicole Roberts, Mohtashim Shamsi, Jennifer Sherry, Angela Shultz, Ahmed Torky, Cassie Wagner, Jennifer Walker, Haibo Wang, Christopher Wienke, Geoffrey Young

Absent: Gary Apgar, Randall Auxier, John Farrish, Jonathan Remo (Proxy Justin Schoof), & Kang Sun

Guests: Greyson Applebee, Iraklis Anagnostopoulos, Richard Beach, Kelly Bender, Kristin Borchers, Benjamin Bricker, Matthew Brown, Isabella Chambers, Hong Cheng, Julie Dunston, Morgan Evans, Melissa Fears-Henley, Rachel Frazier, Brittany Fuqua, Shelly Gehrke, Brandon Hirsch, Zachary Holliday, Jilian Hosteny, Victoria Groves-Scott, Melissa Laake, Austin Lane, Kimberli Morgan, Robert Morgan, Laura Morthland, Trebor Mann, Mike Olsen, Lydia Phelps, Jeffrey Punske, Rebecca Pursley, Ryan Redner, Matt Romero, Aaliyah Russell, David Shirley, Abby Tate, Jan Thompson, Constantinos Tsatsoulis, Journey Short, Sheryl Tucker, Juliane Wallace, Lichang Wang, Wendell Williams, Nick Wortman, Andrew Youpa

III. Approval of Minutes from March 17, 2026

Motion: J. Jamieson

Second: S. Page

A vote commenced: 24 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The minutes from March 17, 2026, were approved as presented.

IV. President's Report: Khalid Meksem

A. Waiting on Chancellor/Provost signatures on resolutions passed by Senate on 3/17/26:

- 1. Resolution RME to Rename Minor in Mythology**
- 2. Resolution RME Rename Sustainable Horticulture System Specialization**
- 3. Resolution RME UG Certificate in AI Social Media Strategist**
- 4. Resolution RME Specialization Companion Animal**
- 5. Resolution Calling for Faculty Oversight of Risepoint Programs (from UEPC)**
- 6. Resolution Regarding Recent Instability in SIU's Academic Leadership (from Governance Committee)**
- 7. Resolution on Senate Support and Leadership - (from Governance Committee)**
- 8. Resolution of SIU Faculty Senate on Senate Support Staff (from Governance Committee)**
- 9. Resolution Regarding Delivery of Online Programs and Courses (from Governance Committee)**

Provost Tucker stated about the resolutions, all the RMEs have a form with approval signatures, and I didn't think we were going to duplicate multiple signatures on these. So, what Grad Council has done, and we asked Faculty Senate to do, *is not even to do a resolution, but just do a vote* because you signed the form, I signed the form, the Chancellor signs a form (*Faculty Senate Packet*) - we sign it and send it to the Board. So those first four, I hope we're not going to add another layer of signatures.

K. Meksem stated I do agree with you on the RMEs. They are set up where we have signatures, so we don't have to get back the signatures. I mean, we have done it, and you and me are familiar with the process. That process has been doing very well, and there is no need to optimize something that's working very well. **Provost Tucker** stated okay, good. **K. Meksem** stated so, for the other ones we did

receive feedback from the Chancellor on some of them. We're still waiting for feedback and signatures on the other ones that are here on the agenda.

- B. Reminder for standing committees (Budget, Governance, UEPC, FSWC, & Committee on Committees) – Final Reports for the Faculty Senate website are due April 30th!**
- C. Announcement: There will be *no guest speakers* at the next Faculty Senate meeting on April 28, 2026. This time will be used to complete Senate work, do elections for officers and chairs/co-chairs of standing committees, and welcome new Senators.**

K. Meksem stated the Provost and Chancellor will be invited to welcome the new Senators.

V. Vice President's Report: Jennifer Sherry

A. Kevin Mercer – Proxy for Cinzia Padovani Fall 2026

B. Faculty Senate Food Drive “Feed the Pack” is from April 1st – May 1st

1. Collection sites for non-perishable items: Pulliam Hall, room 312/307 & Student Center Admin. Office (2nd floor)

2. QR code is available to donate money – (flyer was attached to meeting invite)

J. Sherry stated the students can really use our help this summer and in the fall.

VI. Invited Guests:

A. Chancellor Lane

Chancellor Lane thanked the faculty who helped recruit students, including J. Sherry who went to a couple of high schools and K. Meksem who went to a few takeovers. This morning, we were at Meridian High School, Mounds, Joppa, and right now, we're sitting in the parking lot at Goreville High School. It's really refreshing to hear the principals and superintendents talk about how connected we are in this region to get their students to Southern Illinois University. Now is the yielding time, so, between now and August. A lot of work has to be done to make sure that we always talk about enrollment in the fall, but this is where you get the enrollment is between now and August. VC Wendell Williams and his staff has been out here on the road with us, really connecting with students, but that's going to be critically important - two year community colleges as well in our region - to make sure students transfer. So, a lot of work is being done on that front. We still have a few more weeks to go for the takeover of Southern Illinois. If anyone is interested in joining us, I think we have some faculty members that will be on the road tomorrow as well as Friday to some of our larger schools in our backyard at Carbondale and Murphysboro. But it's very important that we get our students to register. In the registration piece, it's a competitive piece. Other schools are registering their students as well. So, we need to make sure that if any students are obviously reaching out to us, that we connect them in sooner rather than later because they do have options. Today at 3:00 p.m., we are celebrating faculty and staff with awards. So please join us over in Guyon. We'll be there to celebrate. It's always a great time to be able to acknowledge their accomplishments. Last piece, April 28th, and Dr. Meksem, I need to see what time you have for what you just announced. We have our Senate hearing in Springfield on April 28th. So, it's a 5:00 p.m. hearing, but we'll try to work something out and definitely be there to give some words. But I just wanted to give you that date as I thought about it as you announced it. Hats off again to those that are out on the road with us, we appreciate you.

CoS David Shirley showed a PowerPoint slide titled, *“Interim Provost Search Status as of 4/14/26.”*

As of today, we have representation on the committee from several groups, AP Council, Asian Faculty Staff Council, Black Staff and Faculty Council, Civil Service Council, Law School, the FA, Faculty Senate, the GAU, Hispanic/Latino Faculty Staff Council, LGBTQ+ Faculty Staff Council, and NTTFA. At this point, we have 5 applications received. April 13 - April 22 those applicants will go through a process. Right now, they're under review. And then on the 17th, there'll be a day where each applicant will have a screening interview with the committee. And then on the 22nd, the committee will move forward the top four out of those applicants. And those top four will be announced to campus. April 23 - 29th we will have three quarter-day interviews. Each one of these interview sessions will have surveys with them. That first interview session will be with the committee. The second will be with cabinet

members. The third will be with students. The fourth will be a public presentation/forum, and that will be in person and virtual, where the candidates will share about their vision, their priorities, and their experiences. And then lastly, there'll be an interview with Chancellor Lane. May 1st is the target date for the selection and announcement of the *interim* Provost.

B. Provost Tucker

Provost Tucker stated I wanted to let you know we met a milestone. *I approved the first emeritus faculty member today.* We're still working out the process for notification and making sure everybody who needs to know, like the library, HR, etc. But that is done, and I thank you all for your work to get that through the hurdles. That was kind of a 10-year process from the original proposal in 2016 through the end.

C. VCR/Dean of Graduate School: Costas Tsatsoulis

VCR Tsatsoulis stated last week, we had our creative activities and research presentation forum. More than 100 of our graduate and undergraduate students had research posters. A lot of our faculty and also Ph.D. students judged. There were 13 winners who received the certificate for the best poster. The posters covered every single college. In addition to that, right after the posters, at 3:30 p.m. the same day, we also recognized the new REACH and Susan C. Thrasher awardees for undergraduate research, the three 3MT winners, and the Sigma Chi Awards. We also recognized the winners of the outstanding thesis, two of them, and the outstanding dissertation, as well as, the Willis Fellowship awardee. It was great. I hope you had an opportunity to walk by and see the amazing work that our students do. That was last Thursday all day. This coming Thursday, we have the Board of Trustees meeting. The meeting, I know, starts the previous day, but on Thursday, we will be presenting a couple of things to the board. The most important thing is early on; you should all come and look at it. We are highlighting our Center for Fisheries, Aquatics and Aquaculture. The director of the center, Dr. Jim Garvey, will be presenting. We have a very nice video of students, boats, rivers, and fish. It's also the 75th anniversary of that center. We have two research centers, the Wildlife and now the Fisheries, which have reached 75 years. So, this is a great accomplishment given the impact that they have. Finally, I will be discussing with the Board a project and budget approval for \$10.4 million in renovations - two projects are happening with support from the DCEO, the Illinois Innovation Network, the Capital Development Board, the Delta Regional Authority, as well as the SIU Foundation. One of the projects had been partially approved, but now we are adding some funds to it, and we are asking for new project and budget approval from the Board.

D. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE: Lichang Wang

The FAC to IBHE meeting was held on March 20, 2026, at the Rockford University, following my previous report to the Faculty Senate on March 17, 2026. Provost of Rockford University, Elizabeth Davies, Ph.D., presented "Community Partners Become Community Internship Opportunities." She discussed the legacy of Jane Addams including the development of a summer program for women and highlighted how the university has collaborated with local officials in Rockford to strengthen mutual initiatives. There were five other presentations from Rockford University and the mayor of Rockford on the practices of building community and community service. IBHE Board Chair Pranav Kothari talked about the role of IBHE and its proposal of a budget to the Governor's office, typically recommending increases between 1% and 3%. He discussed IBHE's management of statewide data systems and grant administration. In response to questions about whether IBHE serves an advocacy role in higher education, he clarified that while their policies support the sector, advocacy is not their primary function, as other organizations are more directly responsible for that work. IBHE Chair Kothari also talked about student needs and the use of a student needs survey. As part of the SUCCESS program, liaisons on each campus are being asked to identify the basic needs of their students, and he noted that last year's report is available online. A brief discussion was made on the progress at each institution on the compliance and accessibility policies. FAC IBHE members across the six working groups, Mental Health; Technology; Prior Learning Assessment (PLA); Equity; Faculty and Student Mental Health; and Early College, worked on their assigned tasks. Details of the meeting can be found at <http://www.facibhe.org/meetings/minutes.php>. The next FAC to IBHE meeting will be held on May 15, 2026.

E. Graduate Council Chair: Kelly Bender

Resolutions supporting the below have been passed:

- Regular and Substantive Interaction Policy
- Revision of the Morris Doctoral Fellowship eligibility to include international students as well as Master's students that have their undergraduate degree from another institution.
 - It is anticipated that the GRE requirement will be revisited next year.
- The RME to add a Graduate Certificate in Cultural Resource Management has been passed.
- Three Innovative Teaching-TAA proposals were funded supporting a total of 5 graduate assistants for the 2026-2027 academic year.

Our final meeting for Graduate Council will be May 7, 2026. At that time, we'll be inducting 10 new council members, so we're almost having a 50% change in the Graduate Council, and we have, I think, one more RME to review for the semester.

F. Undergraduate Student Government President: Lydia Phelps (comment on Resolution Supporting the New UCC Course Requirements) – (She read her report that was included in the meeting invite.)

USG President Lydia Phelps stated I'm proud to share that our Senate has unanimously passed two separate pieces of legislation, the first being Senate Resolution 2602 and Senate Bill 2555, both of which reflect a strong and unified student voice in support of the proposed university core curriculum updates before the Faculty Senate here today. Together, these measures emphasize the importance of not only consistency, but transparency, and accountability in core courses, particularly through standardized D2L usage, as well as an expectation that significant portions of grades be available prior to final assessments. In summary, these proposals are grounded in a simple but essential principle. Students are most successful when they have timely and reliable access to their academic standing. These efforts are rooted in what we consistently hear from students and student leaders. As Senator Greyson Applebee of the College of Agricultural Sciences noted, understanding grades by midterm is vital for students and university core curriculum courses, because it provides a clear, timely measure of their academic progress. Similarly, Morgan Evans, Director of Academic Affairs, emphasized that access to accurate and up-to-date grading information before finals is essential for informed academic planning and allowing students to identify their weaknesses, seek support in a timely manner, and prepare more strategically. Abby Tate, the current Vice President of Student Affairs, reinforced this perspective through her own experience in one core curriculum course, sharing that often I would not know where I truly stood in this class until well over halfway through the semester. Her testimony highlights how irregular grading practices and heavily weighted finals can create unnecessary stress, particularly in foundational in early 100 to 200 level courses, and why clear grading expectations are critical for student well-being and success. The unanimous support of these two bills demonstrates that students across disciplines recognize the value of these proposed standards. By aligning with policies already in place at peer institutions, these updates would help create a more structural and supportive learning environment. Academic standing, course registration eligibility, and final exam preparation are crucial for students to not only succeed, but thrive here at SIU. On behalf of the Undergraduate Student Government, I respectfully urge Faculty Senate to consider this strong student consensus and to support the implementation of these core curriculum updates. Students are not simply asking for a less rigorous program or easier course load. They are only asking for clear pathways to access it.

G. Senator Jenna Jamieson (Special Olympics)

J. Jamieson stated I am joined by Trebor Mann for Special Olympics. We met with the Chancellor's Office last month to discuss some ways to include more inclusivity and diversity on campus. So, I'll turn it over to Trebor, who's going to provide a bit more information on the Special Olympics. **Trebor Mann** stated I am the Assistant Director of Sports for Special Olympics Region K. We serve the 24th most southern counties of Illinois. Also on this call is Jillian Hosteny. She is our Director of Unified Champion Schools and then Brittany Fuqua, the Director of Region K, my direct boss and good friend. I want to talk about what a Unified Champions School is. There are a few criteria, and the main three

are having unified sport opportunities, inclusive leadership, and whole campus engagement and awareness. So, we'd really like to partner with SIU and really just highlight where you already are meeting these three standards and formalize your position as a Unified Champion School. The current engagement you already have is that the football and basketball teams volunteer. We have partnerships with the athletic department for highlighted games, and members of the SIU swim team actually coach some of our swimming athletes. Benefits that it can offer - high school students are asking what colleges offer unified programs. So, increased recruitment, further community reach, elevated levels of accessibility, inclusion, and equitability on campus. Goals that you already have, just increasing those, and it fits perfectly with the current designation of opportunity university. Benefits specifically to the students - they get to meet inclusion goals set by the university, fully meets equitability goals, and provides space for students to learn and grow socially in a way that will benefit them professionally. We've been working with Jenna Jamieson in our public health department. We had a panel of athletes attend one of her classes and answer questions that they had about how Special Olympics has benefited those students or those athletes' lives. How does this happen without more work? The fact is you guys are already meeting a lot of these requirements. We would just like to find a way to sustain meeting these requirements and really get that stamp and seal of a Unified Champion School. So, the main thing we would need from faculty is a gateway to the student body. We need student-led organizations with a desire to make these connections. We need transition programs or agencies to join them. And then what we need are unified intramural sports. That's something we talked about with the Chancellor being offered through the SIU Rec Center, but providing people to participate in those unified sports is where we're going to see a lot of that student involvement. SIU is already meeting pieces of the strategy, such as the potential of two filled seats for students with disabilities on the undergraduate student government.

H. Prof. Ryan Redner (CBIZ analysis)

(Professor Redner shared a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Critical Flaws in the CBIZ Study.")

R. Redner stated I'm just going to mention what I consider after my analysis, a few critical flaws in the CBIZ study in regard to its mechanism, how it's conducted, and its results. The first critical flaw is an inappropriate peer comparison group. CBIZ selected 14 universities. They described how they selected these as based on a wide range of factors, including their research status, like R1 or R2. So, on the right column here, you can see which of these universities are R2 and R1. Nine of the peer comparisons are R2. Only four are R1, that's 29%. One's not doctoral granting at all. And so, I consider this an inappropriate group if we're in R1 and we're trying to attract and retain R1 faculty. What CBIZ did next is use the median salary from that group for each professor rank. They put them in assistant, associate, and full professor. And if you look at the orange arrow there, it shows it at \$91k, \$100k, and \$130k. At face value, this looks reasonable, but you have to dive a little bit deeper into the mechanics to see how it works. And then where the minimum and maximum come from, that's a little bit sketchier. That seems like it's up to CBIZ quite a bit on how that works. If we look at this midpoint, this brings us to critical flaw #2, which is a misleading midpoint calculation. The midpoint takes 10 years in rank to achieve. So specifically, from CBIZ's own wording, employees move 5% through the range per year of service, meaning moving from the minimum to maximum in 20 years. So, when they say that the median is \$91k, it actually takes an assistant professor 10 years to achieve that salary level. But in terms of how assistant professors work, they're only in rank for six years. So, you see this little table here where you can see the salaries earned by an assistant professor would only be those really at the beginning of the range, never obtaining the median midpoint. So, it's actually a technically unachievable median and it's temporally mismatched to our peers. Essentially, you're not paid that. CBIZ says here's the midpoint, but it's not achievable. You don't actually get it. Another way to look at the data would be the results themselves. We could ask, is the salary study meeting proposed objectives to achieve equity? So, to do this, we could compare the CBIZ results to other public universities that are R1 and R2, and also those public universities in our own state. In terms of my own method to do this, what I did was use the three-year-in-rank data rather than their midpoint. So, that's an assumption of mine in terms of the results that you're seeing. And I use

publicly available AAUP data that's available to everyone to double check that I'm doing this correctly. The results were not encouraging, unfortunately. Where would this put us in the three-year-in-rank data? It would make us 88th of 89. This is not where we are now. This is where the CBIZ study would put us - 88th of 89 in public R1s, 59th of 66 public R2s, and 11th of 12 in terms of public four-year Illinois universities. So, the conclusions from this are the CBIZ salary study fails to provide an accurate or fair assessment of faculty compensation, and it's under-representing the salaries needed to attract and retain faculty at an R1. And my sort of thinking on this is no matter how sophisticated the methods that CBIZ uses, if the results don't achieve the stated goals, we have to reject the study. So, I just came in saying this is a huge problem. Then what do we do? I think there are lots of interesting solutions, but since I'm presenting for 5 minutes, I'll present the most expedient and rapid one would simply be to eliminate the minimum and make the midpoint that they calculated the minimum. So, you eliminate those years 1-9 because they're excessive anyway. You don't need 20 years in rank for an assistant professor and start at the midpoint. And so, what that would do is it's simple - it uses their data, their results. It achieves immediate equity and retains one of the beneficial aspects of the study, which is the yearly progression. But like I mentioned, there's a few other interesting solutions. I'm happy to talk about that later or share anything that I have. I appreciate the time from faculty.

I. Faculty Association President: Matt Romero (CBIZ & Risepoint) – (invited to answer questions)

J. Q & A

J. Sherry stated I have just a statement for the Special Olympics representatives. Dental hygiene is also involved on campus with Special Smiles Program. Actually, our students are going Friday to participate in that, and we have done that for many, many years. And that is a very valuable program and something that the athletes benefit from, and our students. So, we would like to thank you for the partnership that we've been able to enjoy for many years. So, thank you so much. **Trebor Mann** stated thank you; we really appreciate you guys coming out.

K. Meksem stated to FA President Matt Romero – Have you been involved or consulted before the CBIZ study was done and were you given all information about how the CBIZ study was conducted?

M. Romero stated we weren't consulted and some of the means by which they did the study are proprietary. So, we weren't consulted and we can't see inside their black box. I mean, Ryan has done a great job of communicating the shortcomings to the study as far back as last summer. We've been aware of its shortcomings, but not its method. **K. Meksem** stated if you would have had the access to the information that was communicated to you today, how would you sit on the negotiation table with upper administration? **M. Romero** stated well, I'm not on the negotiating team. The bargaining team is assembled now, and they're hard at work kind of doing the CBIZ work for us. They're looking at our data, our live data, and updated data that includes promotions and other things to basically do the compression analysis properly. Because that's part of the shortcoming that CBIZ has redefined compression to mean equity. They're looking at the way we compare outside to other institutions, which is a valid examination that you're obviously showing how low in rank we are amongst our peers. Our understanding was that the process was going to be compression, then equity. Part of the reason for it was an exodus of associate professors. And part of this was aimed at trying to protect the workforce, the core and the future of the workforce. So, compression is a big problem here, especially with the long drawn out hiring freeze that we had as a result of the Rauner years.

S. Page stated did the university pay CBIZ for the study? **M. Romero** stated I believe we did, yes. **S. Page** stated okay, sounds like we wasted some money. The money we paid CBIZ we could have been paying professors. **J. Jamieson** stated how much did we pay for the study? **AVC Nick Wortman** stated thank you for Dr. Redner for his work, much appreciated, and we want to make sure we get this right. We're so glad to have those perspectives coming into the table. I am going to get Dr. Redner and the rest of the FA committee linked up with Joe Rice from CBIZ so we can have some good constructive dialogue around some of these concerns and come to even better solutions. I do also want to address too that the Compensation 2030 was informed by a Steering Committee, and there were a number of

faculty members that were involved in that, including Dr. Rachel Whaley, Cherie Watson, and Dr. Ahmad Fakhoury was also involved in that in a number of meetings. So, just want to recall that we did get some guidance and feedback along the way. And admittedly, it's been a year and a half or two years since we really addressed the faculty part. But again, the value of the perspective and the hard work that went into this, and we want to make sure we get things right. So, I'll be following up with some connection points there as well. The cost of the study, and it's important to keep in mind that not only was the faculty study done, but the staff side was done as well, and a number of tools were provided, and a number of years will also remain in terms of strategic support from CBIZ, and that cost was around \$200,000. **Chancellor Lane** stated just so we're clear on how CBIZ even arrived there was no mandate for us to do a salary survey from anyone. We did this voluntarily. We heard at least six years ago when we came in that it was 10 years without raises. Faculty and staff did not receive raises. We had a number of employees that were doing two and three jobs and not being compensated. We heard from countless staff members that they were not being paid in accordance with where their peers were being paid. So, this study was simply a voluntary study for us to take a look at to find out with all of the complaints that we were receiving, if in fact those complaints were valid. (*Chancellor's audio in Teams went in and out at this point.*)

J. Jamieson stated is the CBIZ contract done now? We paid \$200,000, the contract ended now with CBIZ, and then you stated there's resources and things that are involved. Where can we see all the different things that were involved in that contract? **AVC Nick Wortman** stated I pointed to the Compensation 2030 website. The ongoing support that we receive from CBIZ is annual advice on what we should do with our pay structures in terms of market alignment and adjusting for compression modeling that they are giving us in reaction to changes in market condition, inflation, etc. **J. Jamieson** stated when does the contract end? Is it ongoing? **AVC Nick Wortman** stated I would want to double check, but I think it was initially a three-year agreement with a few options to renew if we wanted to. The vast majority of the work is done, so we're not expecting any substantial or significant work product delivery, but they're essentially on retainer for them to be able to provide us advice, provide a stock market condition report on an annual basis, and if we'd want to make any tweaks or adjustments, we could certainly work with them to do so. **J. Jamieson** stated are we considering a renewal then? **AVC Nick Wortman** stated I won't say that we're considering a renewal in terms of any significant or substantial work, but we do want to keep them available to, again, help us with some of this market alignment movement in the future and answer any questions that we may have. **J. Jamieson** stated is the task force or the initial force that included faculty, is that still part of the equation? Are they still being consulted as well? Is faculty involved in this conversation in terms of the renewal or the continued efforts on the CBIZ contract? **AVC Nick Wortman** stated I can't say that that's been a conversation that I've had with anyone, but yes, we still would be convening the Steering Committee if anything would come back up. And again, all of this information in the study will be used at the bargaining table by the FA. **Provost Tucker** stated I'm surprised to hear that the male versus female was looked at in the CBIZ study because when I met with them as a preliminary to the data going out on faculty, I was specifically told that was not considered. It was just based on rank, assistant, associate, and full. So that's another confusing aspect to this. **Chancellor Lane** stated I apologize for breaking up (*audio*), but let me take us back a couple of years. And this is what I was saying earlier. We had no mandate to do this study at all. This was all voluntary. What pushed us is that we had several faculty and staff that came to us years ago saying they were not being paid appropriately. We had a lot of folks who were taking other jobs at other places because our salary structures were not where they needed to be. We had 10 years of faculty and staff with no raises on our campus. We had folks that have been here 20 years that found out people in the same position who just arrived were making more than them. So, we had no controls over that at all. So, when we took a look, and this is heavily on the staff side, just to address what Dr. Tucker said. On the staff side, we have faculty members by gender, and Nick has all the data. It shows where people were out of position, their salaries were not where they needed to be. Nick, you have data that you could probably share that shows the percentage of increase that everyone received who was either compressed within their salary. Do you have that information? **AVC Nick Wortman** stated correct. **Chancellor Lane** stated that information shows clearly some of the staff members who were really at

a deficit in terms of where their salary was. The other piece to remember is that even though we launched this study, we said that we had to have the state appropriations and the tuition revenue to be able to do anything about any data that we decided was going to be final. And we've been able to make some adjustments and do that for the staff side. The idea is to be able to do that on the faculty side. So, from the professor who was presenting earlier, I think we need to get him with CBIZ so they can see exactly what his concerns are there and they can have those discussions, because now would be the time to do that. I just wanted to give a little bit of history there that the attempt was to finally take a look at some data, which we did not have a couple of years ago to decide where people are. Chances are we're going to be doing this kind of a study - everywhere I've been it's usually about every five years - you take a look at where your faculty and staff are. From a competitive standpoint, yes, we're an R1, but we're a new R1. There's some levels even to R1. So, when we look at those salaries, again, we'll take any feedback that we can get. But I wanted to remind the group, I don't think it's a waste of money at all. In fact, if you look at some of the dollars that have been paid out to our staff, at least on that side and what we're considering for faculty, those adjustments are well worth it for those individuals. So, Nick, I don't know if you have that handy in terms of the number of employees - **AVC Nick Wortman** stated I don't have the numbers off the top of my head. I'll see if I can pull some stuff up and pop those into the chat here. **J. Jamieson** stated what is being done for those that are still suppressed after the study? Even with the new numbers, I've talked to many staff members on campus that have come to me frustrated with that. **AVC Nick Wortman** stated I want to address that in two parts. First for faculty, \$1.2 million is set aside and on the table, and that's what we're going to be negotiating, how to use that \$1.2 million to address some of these compression issues. Again, the model has not been agreed upon, so, there's plenty of room for conversation around what the final model needs to look like. And that's going to be the FA's job at the table. From the staff perspective, we did identify that we are behind the eight ball in terms of market alignment, and we do have considerable amounts of compression. The model that CBIZ has helped us create and work towards is a model that will be living and breathing for years to come. Not only will we be able to take the model and look at the percentage of overall payroll that we've got available for annual increases, when we look at that, let's say that we've got 3% of annual non-represented payroll available for staff increases, we'll be able to plug that into the model and address market alignment and compression issues as we're moving forward. We're also applying those same principles in terms of compression analysis as we're hiring people in. So, as we continue to chip away at the gap, we're going to make sure that we're not really shooting ourselves in the foot by taking a strategic and data-informed approach into hiring new folks as well. **Chancellor Lane** stated you have some data Nick that you could probably put in the chat, but there is data on the staff side. I think a few employees, I remember, got close to 40 some odd percent increases from where they needed to be. And I think that data will be helpful, Dr. Meksem. No problem with sharing that information with the number of employees over the last year and a half that have received increases. We do have that information that we can share with you. **K. Meksem** stated you see, Chancellor Lane, if faculty are getting paid the wages that they deserve, they will do a good job with our students and our students actually are ambassadors to the other students, so we're going to be able to approach more students. So, it's a happy ending for all. **Chancellor Lane** stated that's why we launched the study two years ago. It was based on that premise that we wanted to retain faculty. We knew we were making the move to R1, and we knew we were going to have to keep our faculty to do that. That's exactly why we launched this study. I think it's money well spent. It was to get our faculty in a place where they needed to be, in addition to our staff. So, you hit the nail on the head as to why we launched it.

D. M. Johnson stated if the CBIZ study turns out to be not very useful for compression, which is what the conversation was about at the table two years ago, then one effect of waiting for the CBIZ study will be that faculty will have waited two years to get the \$1.2 million the administration has promised. In other words, that the university will have saved \$2.4 million that would otherwise have spent on faculty. So, I applaud the Chancellor for voluntarily doing a salary study and making the salary situation a priority. Not all chancellors have done that. I think it will be unfortunate if it turns

out that that data is not useful and that faculty waited two years for those \$1.2 million, which we're going to get going forward, but we would have could have gotten perhaps two years earlier.

K. Meksem stated to Faculty Association President Matt Romero – Are there any concerns about Risepoint? **M. Romero** stated we have significant concerns over the introduction of Risepoint into the campus. **K. Meksem** stated can you explain to us some of the concerns, especially if there are any concerning the CBA, the collective bargain agreement, or any other things? **M. Romero** stated the issues are numerous and it's hard to pick one issue. I think there's a threat to the Professors here with Risepoint in that I've already seen leaked emails in which deans are encouraged to ask their directors if the faculty will take less money to teach an eight-week course, which the onboarding that I'm told Risepoint wants us to have is to offer each course twice a semester. So, I've taught 8 week courses; they are the same content as a 16 week course. So that's one example of how the parts of the campus are already preparing to reduce the amount of compensation that we receive to teach more and more sections. So, that's one way we feel that it's a threat. I don't think that faculty have been really apprised on the impact of Risepoint. I have requested from the administration to hold informational meetings that would help to share information with the faculty. The response was that those would be shared with the programs that will experience Risepoint, but we're all on this campus together. So, we'd like more information about Risepoint, but we're worried about its change in culture. Is the institution even ready to adjust to doubling the enrollment of those Risepoint courses or programs? Because we've gone through a period of lower enrollment and our staff has seen hiring freeze, chill, whatever it's euphemized as. We've seen them, but that has had the effect of depleting the university of staff. And so are these students who - we don't know where they're coming from. We don't know what their needs are going to be. So, is the institution prepared to assist non-traditional students who might need further assistance to graduate in a timely manner? But a big fear of ours is that we're creating a debt hole that leaves students who aren't prepared for higher education, leaves them without resources, and all it leaves them with is a mountain of debt. And then Southern Illinois University Carbondale is their memory. And what do they remember of SIU? They never come to town, so they don't remember Carbondale, but they do remember the albatross that they have to carry around for perhaps the rest of their lives. I don't think it's out of line to have those fears. I think that they've happened in institutions owned by private equity that demand higher and higher return for their investments. So, are the services that we provide going to be diminished in order to continue to help Risepoint achieve their profit goal? NTT FA President **Mike Olsen** stated I want to echo the FA President's concerns. We share those concerns and we find them very incredible, realistic concerns. And so, the NTT faculties are united with the TT Faculty Association.

C. Padovani stated I have a question for the undergraduate student (Lydia Phelps). What do you think about this topic of Risepoint? **Lydia Phelps** stated it's not something that's been communicated to me prior. I also know that our student trustee has only been given some low fact points this past week. So, it's something that she will be delegating, I believe, this week with the Board.

J. Jamieson stated Matt Romero, you mentioned asking faculty to do the eight weeks. Are workloads for people that are currently teaching Risepoint fair workloads based on our contracts for those that are in Risepoint programs right now? Are they counting as full? **Matt Romero** stated I assume they are. I think if they weren't that the Faculty Association would hear from them. My understanding, for the most part, those three programs that have Risepoint now are very emphatic supporters of it. I do have a statement from a former faculty who taught in one of those programs who has the opposite feeling. So, I know the messages going upward are sunshine and roses, and we love this plan. But I think there might be some inconsistencies down low, but we haven't seen any need for a grievance or our involvement and workload. **Mike Olsen** stated thank you Jenna for that question about workflow. That raises a very good and critical question, which is that a three credit hour class is a three credit hour class, whether it's eight weeks or 16 weeks. So, from the NTT side of it, for example, if my director gives me two eight-week classes, that's not three credit hours, that's six credit hours. So, in terms of how you scale that up and where that workload goes, I don't understand how you

accomplish that without hiring more faculty, which we know is not going to happen, or trying to exploit or coerce the most vulnerable faculty on campus, which are NTTs, into taking unfavorable workloads, some form of overload compensation. I'm not sure exactly what that looks like, but I don't believe that we have the faculty on campus now to scale this up at the rate at which I believe it's attended.

VII. Reports

A. Executive Committee: Chair, Khalid Meksem

1. Update from FSEC meeting

K. Meksem stated the Faculty Senate Executive Council meet last Tuesday where we went over some issues that were concerns to the Senate. So, one of them was Risepoint, and we had a response sent to the Chancellor about Risepoint. We will have a resolution actually today about it.

B. Election Committee: Chair, Jennifer Sherry

1. Results of Faculty Senate Election – Spring 2026

New Senators:

a. CALPS –Vjollca Konjufca & (returning Senator) Khalid Meksem

b. COBA – Md Shariful (Sharif) Islam

c. CAM – Qian (Jenny) Huang & Julia Rendleman

d. COLA – Christina (Chris) Stantis & Andrew Youpa

e. CHHS – Steven Goetz & Irene Miller

f. SOM – Duda Kvitsiani

g. NTT Faculty – Brittainy Spears, *Carissa Scroggins, & Diedra Hopes

(*Note: As of 4/15/26, Carissa Scroggins stepped down from Senate. Geoffrey Young was next in line to serve due to the votes during the SP26 Election. **G. Young accepted the 3-year NTT term on 4/15/26.**)

J. Sherry stated I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who served on the Faculty Senate this year and for their term, for their great work. And thank you on behalf of the Executive Council.

C. Undergraduate Education Policy Committee: Chair Jonathan Remo (J. Jamieson presented)

1. RMEs: (each RME was read during the meeting)

a. RME Rename School of Journalism & Advertising

b. RME Merge BS Sport Admin & BS Recreation Professions

c. RME for Minor Interior Design

On Tuesday, March 24, 2026, the Undergraduate Education and Policy Committee (UEPC) met and approved supporting resolutions for three Reasonable and Moderate Extensions (RMEs). Seven of the ten UEPC members were present: Drs. Bu, Chiasson, Choiy, Jamieson, Padovani, Remo, and Ms. Abbey Tate, Vice President for Undergraduate Student Affairs. The committee unanimously approved the three RMEs listed above.

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: K. Meksem

A vote commenced: 28 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The (3) RMS shown above (a.-c.) were approved as presented.

2. Resolution for the Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Concerns Related to Risepoint Programs – (The resolution was read during the meeting.)

The UEPC developed a resolution to form an ad hoc committee to address faculty concerns related to Risepoint programs. The vote on the resolution was conducted via Microsoft Polls. Seven of the ten UEPC members participated in the vote, including Drs. Bu, Chiasson, Jamieson,

Martin, Padovani, Perry, and Remo. The resolution passed unanimously, with seven votes in favor, no votes opposed, no abstentions, and three members not voting.

Motion: L. Fredrickson

Second: J. Sherry

A vote commenced: 25 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The Resolution for the Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Concerns Related to Risepoint Programs was approved as presented.

3. Resolution Supporting the New UCC Course Requirements – effective FALL 2026 (request for resolution from APAP Dunston) *(The resolution was read during the meeting.)*

The committee also reviewed and approved a supporting resolution for the new University Core Curriculum course requirements. Undergraduate Core Curriculum Director Jeffrey Punske and Associate Provost for Student Success Shelly Gehrke attended the meeting to address questions regarding the purpose and intent of the proposed requirements. The UEPC approved the resolution with five votes in favor, no votes opposed, and two abstentions.

Motion: K. Meksem; Second: J. Sherry *(discussion shown below)*

D. M. Johnson stated I appreciate the work people have done on this resolution and the very eloquent work done by the student government and by my colleagues in the UEPC. That said, I would *move* that we send this back to the committee on two grounds. First, they discuss the possibility of allowing faculty more flexibility to meet the objectives outlined in the policy, and secondly, that they ensure that the resolution either explicitly endorse a single policy document or have made sure that its language matches a policy document. I've seen the policy document that the UEPC looked at and there's some things I like in the policy document and don't like in the resolution and some things I don't like in the resolution that I like in the policy document. So, there's a bit of, for me at least, confusion about what exactly it is that we're committing to. And I hope that that could be worked out in a way that would get even more support from faculty. So, I *move* that we send it back to UEPC.

Andrew Youpa stated I'm a faculty member in the School of History and Philosophy. And like many of you, I've spent years developing my teaching. I'm open to improving, and I welcome feedback from everyone, colleagues, administrators on how to do so. But pedagogy to me is a core faculty responsibility and decisions about how to structure courses and assess student work are grounded in disciplinary expertise and professional judgment. And so, we should be cautious about replacing that judgment with uniform, one-size-fits-all requirements across very different courses and fields. And so, these policies are being described as best practices tied to student outcomes. It would be helpful, I think, for the Senate to review the evidence supporting this claim, but it would also be helpful for the Senate to review the evidence that the policies might incentivize grade inflation. In my professional opinion, this would be a consequence, especially of the third week rule. So, I would like to encourage continued study of grading patterns and grade inflation in the core so that any policy decisions are grounded in clear evidence about their academic effects. Ultimately, I see this as a question of whether we want to standardize these practices across all courses or preserve faculty judgment and applying them where they are pedagogically appropriate. I appreciate your time, and I also want to thank you all for the resolution you passed in the last meeting about Risepoint.

C. Wienke stated this is a pretty clear infringement of academic freedom. I do think parts of this resolution could be supported, but other parts, like the 70% and the third week, is a no-go for, I think, a lot of us. So, I would *concur with David's suggestion and bring it back to committee* to maybe reimagine it in a way that might be moderate somewhat in a way that might be more agreeable to more of us.

Matthew Brown stated I'm a faculty in philosophy. I want to object to the requirement to use D2L in this resolution. When I teach an in-person course, I don't want to teach a hybrid course. I don't want to develop a bunch of online course materials. It's not part of my agreed upon working conditions that I develop a bunch of online course materials. And I actually think that a lot of that stuff is bad pedagogy, and it's within my professional range to judge it as such, and so I agree that aspects of this resolution are a severe infringement on academic freedom.

K. Meksem stated I've heard now three times the infringement of academic freedom. Can any one of the three speakers that actually just spoke before explain to me how this is an infringement of academic freedom? **D. M. Johnson** stated, I'll just give an example of something I do in some of my classes. I think we see in the chat from my colleague Katie Moore in ASL. I mean, I think that's probably a better example, is that D2L doesn't work for what they need to do in ASL classes. And so, they use another learning management software program that I know my colleagues in ASL do a fine job, and I think they meet the objectives of this policy using a separate learning management system. If we require them to also use D2L, you're going to get inconsistency, you know, human beings being human beings, and what is said in one platform or one in another. I mean, I've tried that, but at least I can't keep them consistent. On my own case, I use Discord sometimes in my courses as a chat app, which is far superior to any comparable to D2L. At least taken literally, the policy document that Jeff has just now kindly shared with us in the chat would appear to rule that out. Again, at least in my case, I think this gap is bridgeable. I may not be for everybody. I think it is in my case, but I made the motion I made because I think some bridging work needs to be done in order to allow me as a faculty member and my colleagues to exercise our academic judgment informed by years of experience and training about how to meet the goals of the policy, which are goals we all agree with. **Matthew Brown** stated my understanding is that academic freedom encompasses in part the freedom of faculty to decide on the content and methods of teaching without interference from administration, board of trustees, political figures, etc. What I see here is administration telling us how to teach, which is infringing on that principle. **UCC Director Jeffrey Punske** stated I want to respond to a few of these. So, this is responsive to student needs. As you saw, supporting resolutions were unanimously surpassed by the undergraduate student government. And you've heard now from multiple students in Lydia's very clear presentation that this is a problem. So, I don't think we can just continue to kick this can down the road and say, oh, somehow this will magically get fixed because we have too many students that are falling behind because we are not giving them the tools that they need to succeed. And that is, in my mind, unacceptable. I want to respond to a few specific things. Nothing in the policy - and this is the policy that was provided to UEPC - requires the creation of additional online content. The minimum requirements are simply the syllabus be posted, the grade book be used, and external items, meaning like, a reading that is not part of the textbook be available to students through the LMS platform. That can be through a link, that can be through anything. Dave Johnson wants to use a Discord chat, that the link to the Discord chat be present in the D2L frame, so they don't have to remember, oh, I'm using this website for this class, this website for this class, this website for this class, and it's designed to reduce that cognitive load. I'm not responsible for the drafting of the resolution, but the language explicitly says that nothing in this policy prevents evaluation based on improvement, disallows replacement based grading, portfolio based grading, nor should it. It also is not meant to limit grading schemes that are clearly communicated to the students and in the course syllabus and provides a regular and substantive mean of student feedback. The main thing here is that we were providing consistent student feedback prior to the end of term. And you've heard from, and we'll hear from more students. I know students have really been clamoring about this, that there are eight week courses where they don't receive feedback till week 6, 7, or sometimes 8. There are 16 week courses where they're not receiving feedback until week 13. That's past our drop deadlines. That's past their ability to get into other courses. And when we look at the requirement for the three week, it says there's no specific activity required. Just simply that that is a way for us to log

that the student is still involved in the class. Ideally, it's something that has some substance to it. So, the student has a sense of how am I going to be able to perform in this class? Do I need to get out of Calculus 2 and slide down to another math before it's week 13. And with regards to academic freedom, the fact that we have a core curriculum committee that reviews the syllabi, that determines the course content of that is by Matt Brown's definition, a breach of that administrative override. The core curriculum has the right to set the standards for what it means to be a core class. SIU **student Aaliyah Russel** stated I work as a CPS mentor at Academic Coaching and Exploratory Office. It is frustrating when - I wanted to piggyback off Jeff - he has said about the D2L. It's hard when our professors are not putting any grade in their gradebook. It's hard to reach out to them and ask them what our grade is, and they don't reach back fast enough. Some students that come into the office wondering what their grades are, and it's nothing for us to tell them or show. They say they're struggling, then we email them to ask how can they improve or what can they do? And it's no answer or they just say they haven't been doing this, but it's no reason for us to understand how they can pass their class when we don't know our grade in the class in general. So, I wanted to see how can that be fixed, because some of our professors should use D2L. That's the only reason how we connect with the school.

C. Padovani stated your question was why do we think that this resolution fringes upon our academic freedom? The issue of assessment, and I mean assessment is part of pedagogy, so, the structure of grading is also a pedagogical design. So, I agree that we should get back to the students time, etc., but to tell me that I have to provide 70% of the grade by week 7? It depends, and so I agree with Andrew, for instance, I think with this perhaps different disciplines have different pedagogy.

Andrew Youpa stated I just wanted to add, the arguments that have been made are at best, they support the view that these should be taken as advisory, not one size fits all requirements for all courses in the core. And I certainly don't think that they should be mandated across the curriculum, not just in the core, but across the curriculum. I think that would be even more obvious. I don't think we should outsource pedagogy to RisePoint, and I certainly don't think we should outsource our pedagogy to the administration. And my worry here too is that different professors can be perceived in different ways as far as how demanding they are. You know, students will perceive a professor as demanding and others as less demanding. And one of my concerns is that that's what this third week rule would help students see is whether they think a professor is demanding and then drop the course and take a course that they think might not be as demanding. And to me, that just seems to set things up in a way that would, over time, result in professors feeling more pressure to be less demanding since students will drop after week three if they come off as like this is going to be a hard course. But I think that's part of pedagogy as career educators. We know what our students are capable of, and sometimes they don't even know that. But with over 20 years of experience of teaching in the core, I've gotten a pretty good sense of what students are capable of, even when I think in some cases they don't know it. And so, they're going to be uncomfortable with some of my standards at times, not thinking, well, there's no way I can actually do this. But I know they can because I've seen it over the course of my 20 years. And that's a judgment call that I need to be able to make in my classrooms.

C. Wagner stated I keep getting hung up in this discussion and struggling that this resolution addresses just the core curriculum courses, the courses that have applied to be part of the core curriculum and have been approved to be part of the core curriculum. This isn't the whole university. And I'm wondering how much difference that makes in terms of the very real concerns about academic freedom. You're already applying to put them into this program and agreeing to abide by certain standards to be part of the core curriculum, to meet certain requirements, to serve certain needs. Does that change the opinion or are we treating academic freedom as absolute in all cases and forgetting or glossing over the fact that there is a selection process and you're already agreeing to perhaps compromise your absolute academic freedom to be part of

the core curriculum. And I'm just struggling mightily with that. I've heard from my faculty. I'm hearing the discussion from the faculty here. I'm hearing the students very loudly, and I understand what they're getting at. So, I'm just very torn on this, and I'm not sure what the solution is. And I'm interested to have this discussion continue so I can kind of try and wrap my head around the best way to approach what is clearly a problem for the students and clearly an issue that is very meaningful and important to the faculty at the same time. And perhaps they're almost, in some cases, they are rather opposed to each other.

K. Meksem stated thank you, Cassie. Actually, what you said is very wise, and that's why since my colleague Jonathan Remo is not here today to keep the discussion going for this, I would like to bring this to the next meeting. If everybody is agreeable, we're not going to vote on this today. So, until we have a broad discussion on the elements that are in the resolution, and at that moment when we feel like the resolution is ready to go on a vote, then we will vote on it.

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: K. Meksem

A vote commenced: 26 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The Faculty Senate approved to **TABLE** the discussion until the next meeting.

D. Budget Committee: Chair, David M. Johnson

1. Update on April 6, 2026, meeting with admin.

D. M. Johnson stated we were working on a report that will be based in some large part on a meeting that we had with administrators on April 6th, where we discussed athletics and also RisePoint finances. Briefly put, both of them are somewhat complicated. But there are reasons to continue the conversation in both cases, with the acute questions being, where is our athletics deficit and is our athletics budget overall sustainable given the decreased size of our student body. And when it comes to RisePoint, I think it's still an open question whether the current RisePoint programs are actually profitable. They are taking in more money than direct instructional costs require but not enough money if you use the same tuition recovery rate and overhead costs that are applied for the summer. So, I'll leave that as a teaser for a fuller and hopefully more coherent report.

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

F. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee: Chair, Mohtashim Shamsi

1. Faculty Survey Regarding CBIZ Compensation Study *(A PowerPoint presentation was shared.)*

The committee conducted a survey on salary and their work conditions. The salary results were compiled based on rank and colleges. The purpose was to make the faculty aware of CBIZ study and find how far they are from the proposed structure and determine whether the plan to raise the salaries by 2030 is on the right track.

M. Shamsi stated we heard a lot about the CBIZ study today. And for that, we tried to collect real data from the faculty. The slide you are seeing right now tells you whether they were able to see any adjustment or raise in their salary from last fall. So, there were 130 responses. This study was done because no current salary data was presented with CBIZ study to know how far we are from the proposed structure. Since some faculty do acknowledge that they have seen a raise in their salary recently, nevertheless, the question was whether the raise was across all disciplines and how much. So out of 130 respondents, 35% say no and 34% said not sure. What it means is the raise was not noticeable. So those who said yes, we found a big range and anomalies. For example, for full professors they reported their raise from \$100 per month to \$1,100 per month. I think this \$1,100 was an anomaly, an outlier. And the average was \$450. For associate professors, the raise was \$24 per month to \$500 per month with an average of \$200 per month. For assistant professors, they reported \$38 per month raised to \$2,000 per month with an average of \$600. So, this \$2,000 per month is also an outlier and it is very anomalous, so we need to look at it. On the next slide you see the real data in the bar graph, and we are comparing to the top chart from CBIZ where they give the lowest, mid, and high salary point. So,

you can see we are going to look at one by one from full professor on top left where you can see most colleges are lower than the lowest point in the proposed structure. Others are just between the lowest and midpoint. So, nobody is actually passing midpoint, and most of them are lower than the proposed salary structure from CBIZ. And in associate professor rank, most colleges are way below the lowest point, as low as \$20,000, which is very concerning. Only two disciplines that reach the highest proposed salary; there are colleges mentioned, and the average salaries with their respective range. And on the assistant professor side, all of the colleges are way below the lowest point, however, the gap is not as big as associate professors. For non-tenure track professors, most of them are making even less than postdoc and can't even afford a house, as reported by one of the welfare committee members. The point is that the gap is big, and is the plan good enough to adjust the salaries by the inflation rate in 2030? So, these are the concerns of the faculty from this data we collected.

K. Meksem asked about COBA (College of Business & Analytics) – they were not in the report. **M. Shamsi** stated it depends on who responded or if they received the link. I think there should be an extension of the deadline or we need to reach out to them to respond. Also, out of the 130 who responded, many did not report their salary. Some of the report salaries don't even have an error bar or anything, because only one person from that college reported their salary.

K. Meksem stated the survey also has some qualitative data about anxiety level, working conditions, etc. **M. Shamsi** stated we had several questions around that. The committee will make a report towards the end of the month. Most are negative comments on how it's negatively impacting their health and mental condition.

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

J. Qin stated there is nothing to report at this moment.

VIII. Old Business - (none)

IX. New Business

K. Meksem asked M. Shamsi if it were possible for the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee to look at the diversity, ethnicity, etc., within our university and Senate. Responses in the FSWC survey can't be shared publicly. About 80% of the responses I read talked about a negative impact. I would really encourage you to see within our university, someone who can help to take over that data and see if there is something that can be done about the mental health of our faculty here at SIU, please.

X. Adjournment

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: K. Meksem