

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2025
Via MS Teams & Morris Library Room 754
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order: Khalid Meksem

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

II. Roll Call: John Farrish (*Melissa Laake*)

Present: Gary Apgar, Randall Auxier, Erica Blumenstock, Lingguo Bu, Lavern Byfield, Kwangho Choiy, Laurel Fredrickson, Ghassan Ishak, David M. Johnson, Seung-Hee Lee, Yueh-Ting Lee, Jia Liu, Khalid Meksem, Katie Moore, Cinzia Padovani, Shelly Page, Jun Qin, Jonathan Remo, Nicole Roberts, Mohtashim Shamsi, Jennifer Sherry, Ahmed Torky, Cassie Wagner, Haibo Wang, Christopher Wienke, Benna Williams, Geoffrey Young

Absent: Nwamaka Anaza, Daniel Bronke, Christopher Chiasson, Marissa Ellermann, John Farrish, Erin Hascup, Frances T. Lee, Kaitlyn Poirier, Jennifer Walker (Proxy Alicia Cremeens)

Guests: Jebaraj Asirvatham, Wesley Calvert, James Carter, Julie Dunston, Paul Frazier, Rachel Frazier, Shelly Gehrke, Renada Greer, Gireesh Gupchup, Melissa Laake, Austin Lane, Kristopher Marshall, Brenda Martin, Kimberli Morgan, Mark Peterson, David Shirley, Susan Simmers, Constantinos Tsatsoulis, Sheryl Tucker, Juliane Wallace, Todd Wakeland, Lichang Wang, Wendell Williams

III. Approval of Minutes from April 29, 2025

Motion: L. Fredrickson

Second: D. Johnson

A vote commenced: 20 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The minutes from April 29, 2025, were approved as presented.

IV. President's Report: Khalid Meksem

K. Meksem stated I would like to welcome the new Senators and my colleagues from last year and the year before. I'm hoping that we can do a good job and work together. To work together, we need committees, and that brings me to the next thing, which is we have to approve our committee members and the committee Chairs and Co-Chairs. Before that, I would like to thank Jennifer Sherry for actually working so hard to bring the committees and everyone together. Just a few reminders, when you want to talk, please state your name. This way we know who you are. Also, state your name when we have a motion and a second.

V. Presentation of the Standing Committees: Jennifer Sherry

J. Sherry stated at the last Faculty Senate meeting on April 29, 2025, I was asked to remain on the Committee on Committees (CoC) and was assigned the task to complete the Standing Committees list for Budget, Faculty Status & Welfare, Governance, and Undergraduate Education Policy Committee. Melissa Laake began filling in a spreadsheet with everyone's first choice preference. I assumed the role of getting this completed by using the Committee Preference Sheet. Since I was a member of the CoC, I continued the task to have each committee vote on a Chair/Co-Chair. I sent out a call to each Standing Committee to vote for these positions. They voted and then CoC voted; both approved with majority vote for the following results: **Budget Committee Chair Geoffrey Young, UEPC Co-Chairs Yueh-Ting Lee and Jonathan Remo, Governance Committee Co-Chairs Randy Auxier and Jun Qin, and Faculty Status and Welfare Committee Co-Chairs Gary Apgar and Frances T. Lee.** This requires a Faculty Senate vote today.

Note: Nwamaka Anaza and Seung-Hee Lee were originally selected for Co-Chairs for the Governance Committee, however, Nwamaka Anaza is on sabbatical and Seung-Hee Lee cannot serve in this role at this time.

Note: Faculty Status and Welfare Committee originally selected Gary Apgar as Chair, however, he would prefer to work with a Co-Chair due to his workload in the upcoming year. So, I sent an email to Frances T. Lee to see if she would serve as Co-Chair, and she agreed.

The Committee on Committees did not have a Chair/Co-Chair as of yesterday, however, I will be bringing some names to the floor that have agreed to Co-Chair the committee.

After reviewing the Faculty Senate Operating Paper, as the Vice President of the Faculty Senate, I cannot sit on committees and am resigning from the CoC and the FSWC as of the end of business yesterday, (5-12-25). I have sent an official resignation letter to Melissa Laake and Khalid Meksem, and it has been shared as an attachment for today's meeting. At the April 29, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting, Cheryl (Shelly) Page voiced an interest in being on the CoC. Since I am resigning, I would like to nominate Cheryl (Shelly) Page to fill the vacancy on the CoC. This will require a Faculty Senate vote today.

I would like to thank the Standing Committee members for their diligence in selecting Chairs and Co-Chairs as well as the Committee on Committees for voting for these positions in a very quick turnaround. Also, I would like to thank Melissa Laake for her help in this process and for always keeping us on track.

VI. Confirmation Votes of the Chairs, Co-Chairs and Committee Members

Faculty Senate Standing Committees and *Chairs/Co-Chairs (bolded)* for 2025-2026

Budget Committee	Faculty Status & Welfare Committee	Governance Committee	Undergraduate Education Policy Committee	Committee on Committees
Christopher Wienke	Catherine (Cassie) Wagner	Ghassan Ishak	Christopher Chiasson	Cheryl (Shelly) Page
Benna Williams	Cheryl (Shelly) Page	Kaitlyn Poirier	Jonathan Remo	Gary Apgar
David M. Johnson	Frances T. Lee	Katherine (Katie) Moore	Yueh-Ting Lee	Laurel Fredrickson
Erica Blumenstock	Lavern Byfield	Nwamaka Anaza	Kwangho Choiy	Lingguo Bu
Erin Hascup	Nicole Roberts	Seung-Hee Lee	Cinzia Padovani	Seung-Hee Lee
Geoffrey Young	Laurel Fredrickson	Jia Liu	Daniel Bronke	Jonathan Remo
Haibo Wang	Marissa Ellerman	Jun Qin	Lingguo Bu	Mohtashim Shamsi
Jennifer Walker	Gary Apgar	Ahmed Torky		
	Mohtashim Shamsi	Randall Auxier		

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: M. Shamsi

A vote commenced: 24 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. Cheryl (Shelly) Page was approved as presented to be added as a member to the Committee on Committees. (Jennifer Sherry resigned from CoC.)

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: C. Padovani

A vote commenced: 24 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The committee members and Chairs/Co-Chairs (listed above) for Budget, Faculty Status & Welfare, Governance, and Undergraduate Education Policy committees were approved as presented.

Motion: J. Sherry

Second: L. Fredrickson

A vote commenced: 23 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. Jonathan Remo and Cheryl (Shelly) Page were approved to serve as Co-Chairs for Committee on Committees.

Motion: S. Page

Second: J. Remo

A vote commenced: 24 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. Jennifer Sherry's resignation from the CoC and FSWC was approved as presented. (She is currently serving as Vice President.)

K. Meksem stated J. Sherry did an excellent job and her resignation from CoC and FSWC has been accepted. Thank you for serving!

VII. Reports

A. Executive Committee: Chair, Khalid Meksem

K. Meksem stated I would like to ask for Chairs and Co-Chairs to present themselves. In addition to attending the Faculty Senate Executive Council meetings, you will have to send us a report at the end of the year about the activities of your committee. So, please keep everything that you're doing. You can e-mail your report to Melissa Laake. This way we have those reports and of course the final reports could be a combination of those reports and other things that will happen during the year. So, a report is needed from every Chair of the committees. Of course, you can work with your Co-Chairs, which will make it easy to send that report.

B. Election Committee: Chair, Jennifer Sherry – (no report)

C. Undergraduate Education Policy Committee: Co-Chairs, Yueh-Ting Lee & Jonathan Remo

YT Lee stated so far, we have six RMEs which should have been processed last semester, and one of them was missing which we are going to work on. Because faculty members will be off contract, we may not work on them until school begins in the fall.

J. Remo stated I am a Professor in the School of Earth Systems and Sustainability. This is my 5th month on Senate, and we learn by doing here. So, here I am learning.

K. Meksem stated I strongly advise the Chairs and Co-Chairs to meet with the members of the committees to explain the work. We are all learning by doing, of course. So, if you have served before, it'll be easy to explain it to the others.

D. Budget Committee: Chair, Geoffrey Young

G. Young stated I am an Assistant Lecturer at the Center for English as a Second Language. I'm starting my 4th academic term at SIU, and I look forward to also learning by doing.

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

(See section C. above for J. Remo's introduction.)

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

G. Apgar stated I too had experience from last year. So, hopefully this time will be a little more inclusive if you will, because I'd like to solicit as much input from the general senatorial group for anything that we can do to move the relationship with faculty and administration forward.

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

R. Auxier stated I was on the Governance Committee this past year. We have some stuff in the pipeline to bring before the Senate already. I'm Co-Chair because I'm out of the country half the year, including right now; I'm in Poland. I more or less know what I'm doing on this committee so, learning by doing was last year and now, doing by doing things should be this year.

Jun Qin stated I'm an Associate Professor from the School of Electrical, Computer, & Biomedical Engineering. I'm learning by doing; there's a lot of things to learn.

VIII. Old Business

K. Meksem stated we have a few items from the old business that we still have to finish, and we're going to go through that in our next meeting because there is nothing that we can do now. Summer is coming and everybody's going to go. So, it's not going to make any sense to go through that now.

IX. New Business - (none)

Motion: K. Meksem (break for 5-10 minutes until guests arrive)

Second: L. Fredrickson

X. Invited Guests:

A. Chancellor Lane

Chancellor Lane stated congratulations on almost completing a semester. I know some folks are still here, and it was great seeing everyone at commencement. It's a little bittersweet seeing those students leave us. What I always think is so special is when our faculty are celebrating those students as they come off the stage. I don't think I've seen any place to ever do that. It's pretty unique to Southern. So, thanks to you guys who were down there high fiving those students; they'll remember that for a lifetime. We brought a team of folks with me today, and they have some pretty neat updates for you on our campus Retention Model. We have spent probably the last part of the year or at least half the year trying to think about what we could do to improve our retention rates across campus. Many of you probably know that we have an overall goal from fall to spring to be at about 90% and from fall to fall about 80%. Our four-year and six-year graduation rates - we're looking at bumping those up as well. Our progression rates, how students get from freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior is important. And so, just like enrollment has really been our focus over the last five years (we've showed some pretty considerable gains in those areas when we've been able to be strategic), we're doing the same thing for retention, because we know that's just as important.

B. Provost Tucker

Provost Tucker stated for the University Honors Director's position I hope to have an announcement closer to the end of the week. The Core Curriculum Director announcement will be going out. Some of you are aware that your colleague Dr. Jeff Punske will assume that position on July 1, 2025. And today there's a message going out from me, if you haven't seen it yet, to all faculty a reminder we are missing an extensive list of fall textbooks that already need to be listed for students who have registered. We need to get those lists for the fall. So, please work with your school Director, and if you don't need anything for fall, we need to know that as well so that we're not waiting. Also, that e-mail talks about (we'll be talking more with Faculty Senate) fall 2026 we will be moving to D2L for lower division and core curriculum courses. That is not for upper division or graduate level courses. Some of you already do that. That's great, but this is to support student retention. As the Chancellor said, there's a group of us that have been working to make sure we are supporting all our students and looking at some of the gaps that exist in the demographics to ensure that we have an opportunity when a student comes in the front door they leave with a degree. Dr. Gehrke, our Associate Provost for Student Success, is going to present an overview there. And then, we do have a team, VC Wendell Williams, Exec. Dir. David Shirley, and VC Paul Frazier, Exec. Dir. Renada Greer, and Dir. Kris Marshall to answer any questions you might have. This is just a one-page slide of a summary so you get an idea of where we're headed.

R. Auxier asked Provost Tucker if there was an update on the claim of the university owning everything that we put on D2L; this came up in the last meeting. Provost Tucker stated thank you for reminding me. When faculty put materials in our coursework Learning Management System, our LMS, which is D2L Brightspace, that is still the ownership of the faculty. The only time that is different is when you have been paid specifically to develop course materials. So, maybe you've been paid over the summer to do something. Sometimes you're paid to do a course shell for your colleagues to use, because you all teach the same thing, like English 101, but the use of D2L does not change your intellectual property rights. R. Auxier stated is there a side letter with the collective bargaining agreement that says that? Because this is the kind of thing that ought to be in writing. I mean, I'm not trying to be difficult or anything. Provost Tucker stated to my knowledge there's nothing in writing that contradicts the intellectual property policy. So, that would really be more of an FA question, but the IP policy supports your ownership of your course materials, whether they happen to be in D2L or not. So, really the modality, the course doesn't change it.

C. Wienke stated he received an email stating that all UCC courses are going to be required to be in D2L. Is this temporary? Provost Tucker stated, "No." To support student success and retention we will be using D2L for all lower division and core curricular courses starting in fall 2026. So, there will be templates provided. There will be basic things that have to be there - the syllabus, course materials, etc. We will also be providing you with new resources in terms of you'll be able to do your alerts through there, upload your grades directly into Banner from there, be able to do your course

assessments, and UCC has required assessments within D2L. We're really trying to move to a reduced workload. Once faculty get into D2L, you can do everything within that in an easier manner.

L. Fredrickson stated I teach art history, and I post my lectures after I give my lectures in a PDF form for my students so that they have the images that I lectured about. Now, do I retain that intellectual property? Provost Tucker stated, "Correct." If it's a pdf, we have to make sure that it is accessible under the new federal rules as well.

K. Meksem stated Provost Tucker what would be really helpful is if you can send us something that we can use in our next meeting to support the move to D2L. This way most faculty are going to know what belongs/not belong to them. This way it can make a vote, if needed, very easy to support this initiative. Provost Tucker stated we will work on that. Chancellor Lane stated I don't know if there's some retraining that needs to occur for those who weren't using it yet. Provost Tucker stated our Center for Teaching Excellence is gearing up for those days you come back on contract before the semester starts because again, this is not this fall, but we want people to start transitioning. We will have extensive training for those of you who are new to D2L all the way to those who are new to just the assessment piece. I'll start documenting this, maybe that July meeting, to talk about the different elements. I've been trying to give just enough of a heads up as people think about developing courses for this fall. Some people may want to go ahead and switch over the summer to this fall and then kind of update that as they go along. There will be self-help videos too.

C. VCR Tsatsoulis

VCR Tsatsoulis stated I just wanted to thank the faculty who came to the two graduation ceremonies - four best hours of at least of the life of these young men and women and their families/loved ones (2 hrs. for each ceremony). So, I wanted to thank you. I also wanted to thank the Faculty Senate for their work this past year, and I'm looking forward to working with you all next year.

D. APSS Shelly Gehrke: Retention Model

(A slide titled, "SIU Retention Model – Southern Opportunity Scholar Initiative, SOSI" was shared on the screen.) APSS Gehrke stated I've been at SIU since September, so I hope to work more closely with several of you all in this governing body in the future. What we're looking at right now is a high level one page slide regarding the Retention Model that you've probably heard the Chancellor talk about a lot. Right now, it's called Southern Opportunity Scholars Initiative (SOSI). The big picture of this is we are going to take some of our students for whom we currently have special review for admission and create a program that makes the students interested eligible for conditional admissions if they come in with a GPA between 2.00 and 2.74 from high school. If they are interested in this program, they'll also have an opportunity to write a hundred-word statement that will be part of the consideration for their admittance into a school or college. The applications through admission are all due May 1st. VC Wendell Williams can talk more about any pieces of the Admissions process that you want to learn, but students will be required to turn around and say yes or no, I want to be considered for this program. Students will be enrolled in either an academic unit (a college or school) or they'll be part of the SIU SOSI program - I would say similar to our current COLA SSI program. There will be criteria that students have to adhere to and meet, including successful completion of a summer class prior to their fall classes. They are going to have criteria and a contract that includes every other week academic advising/R&R meetings, working with a peer mentor, and work with Dr. Kris Marshall's team on wraparound services that are going to include student support and programming, coordinated across campus. The colleges and schools may have additional criteria that they build in for the students in this conditional admittance category as they admit to their units. Then we will (complementing what the Provost said) have some criteria that they have to meet regarding monitoring, attendance, grades and their engagement with the various support services and wraparound programming.

Chancellor Lane stated I want to share a little background as to why we decided to dig into this. As I mentioned earlier, the focus in the first five years has been muchly tied to enrollment. But when you start looking at our retention numbers it gets pretty ugly. In some areas, we are below some national standards that we'd like to be above. We have predictive analytics that tells us that if you're a

student from Cook County or the Chicago metro counties, if you're African American or Hispanic, even in some cases rule white, if you're Pell eligible, if you're first generation, if you've attempted less than 15 credit hours in your term, if you got a D, F, or W in core curriculum, or if you have a balance - the chances of you persisting from one semester to the next is pretty slim. We have the data on the achievement gaps. (David Shirley shared a slide on the screen titled, "Comparing Gaps – SIUC to National.") The only test case we have is probably in the Future Scholars Program. We have success in those cohorts when we're very intrusive with students that are predicting to come in and maybe not succeed in the way that we want them to.

VC Williams stated I'd like to add that I want to make it real clear that we're not expanding admission standards or lowering admission standards. These are the exact same standards that we've used in the past. The way that works is that a student who applies to SIU if they have a 2.75 or better, they are automatically admitted into the university. There are some schools or colleges that have higher standards for admissions, but this general admission is 2.75. If a student is below a 2.75, we currently send that information to the school or the college, and they will decide whether to accept that student based upon a holistic review process or not. It is that group of students who have not been successful in the past. So, this new program, what we're doing now is that we will follow the same process. It will go to the school of the first choice, the school of the 2nd choice, and if they're not selected there, then it will go to the College of Liberal Arts for a special committee to review. Before that information is sent to the schools or the colleges, we will send out an agreement or a "contract" that the student has to commit to doing certain things (go to tutoring & a number of other things inside of that contract). So, we are now getting a commitment that they're going to put forth their best effort to succeed, in addition to us just putting forth our best effort to try to help them succeed.

D. Shirley stated we track for our retention figures; we don't look at every single student that comes in. We're interested in the full-time, first-time student. There are about 1,623 of those for fall 2024, and that number that represented high school GPAs under 2.75 was about 30%. So, this could potentially have dramatic impacts.

E. VC Susan Simmers: Travel Voucher Reimbursements

(A slide was shared on the screen titled, "Travel Reimbursements.") VC Simmers stated we have one FTE that processes all travel, and we have two FTEs that process all our other accounts payable for the university. In fiscal year 2024, we processed 3,051 travel expense reports. After we date stamp them in, we are committed to a 30-day audit and turnaround time to pay them. Sometimes we have expense reports with errors or incomplete data, and that takes a little longer. Expense reports are always processed pretty much first in first out. So, after the expense report is audited and checked for all corrections, we put it on the next ACH check run to be paid. I wanted to make everyone aware of the taxation policy. The Internal Revenue Service requires that we have an accountable plan, and we must enforce it. And so, the important thing to remember is that the timeline for the IRS plan is 60 days. After 60 days, the expense report is taxable, and we have to remit the amounts to payroll to gross up the employees W2. Here's the really important part. This is our accountable plan for the 60 days, because the IRS doesn't tell us exactly how we have to implement the 60-day rule. Day one is the first day that the traveler returns from the trip. The *final fiscal officer signature* must be obtained *within sixty days* after the traveler returns from the trip. Sometimes maybe there's more than one fiscal officer signature on a travel reimbursement, but the final fiscal officer's signature must be obtained within sixty days after the traveler returns from the trip. Notice that doesn't say the expense report has to be paid within 60 days. It says the *final approval* must be obtained *within 60 days*. That is how we count the 60-day rule. If the travel report is not approved within the time frame, then it becomes taxable. So, the signature and date of that final fiscal officer's signature is the important piece to remember there. Now, as we audit expense reports (they really should be thoroughly audited before they come to accounts payable for payments) we audit them to make sure that we don't show up in legislative audit reports for travel expense and have legislators here, our senators and Congress people in the state, asking Chancellor Lane about audit findings on travel. So, we are very meticulous in the accounts payable department on auditing these expense reports, but

in reality, they should be well done and audited before we receive them, because that's part of what takes our department a good portion of those 30 days to turn them around. And the reason it takes us quite a bit of time to process them is we're finding that travel forms are often not filled out correctly (supporting documents are often missing, expense forms don't always agree with receipts, expense forms are missing approval signatures, and budget purposes are sometimes missing). Those are some of the big issues that we see quite frequently. And about half of the reports that come in with errors, Julia can correct herself. If it's a missing BP or something like that, she'll just go ahead and fill it in, take care of it and get it paid. But about 25-35% come in with errors where the department must be contacted for more information, and obviously those take more time to reconcile and get paid. So, some of the most common errors that we see are the per diem is not calculated correctly. That's confusing to folks. Lump sum amounts for lodging are often not put in the categories the way they need to be properly by the day. Oftentimes, preparers put things in the wrong categories, or they don't include travel dates and times. And sometimes travelers put upgrades on P-Cards, and we have to request an exception form. We have to determine if that upgrade is allowable. Often, they're not allowable, and we have to seek reimbursement from the employee. There's another issue. If you travel a lot, you should have a university P-Card, but you have to turn in your travel according to the P-Card reconciliation rules too. That cuts down on people complaining that they've got travel expenses on their personal Mastercard or Visa. So, I wanted to know how our team can help after I learned about these issues, and so, we went out and had a couple of listening sessions on campus. We held two campus listening sessions on travel in the Guyon Auditorium on March 4th and 5th, and we got a lot of really good suggestions. We had probably 50-60 people there both days. And here are some of the key suggestions we got: the audience felt that the travelers themselves needed more training, they would like a "know before you go" type video, they would like a video based training so people can watch it online and not have to go to a class on campus and that way it's available on demand, they gave us suggestions on how we can improve our travel voucher form design, we talked a lot about making it electronic so it can route better and faster and have date stamping on it, they talked about our instruction manual and would like us to make edits and improvements to that, people get messed up on the per diem a lot because even though we are allowed to use the federal rate, the state has a quarter day provision, and discussion about if we could do some kind of calculator that people could put the GSA federal number in and get the quarter day calculation that they need for their partial days on their expense report, people thought would be helpful. And then I had a follow-up meeting with Dr. Khalid Meksem, Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee, Dr. Rachel Whaley, Charlie Cox, and Julia Castle. We all got together on Friday, April 18th and we talked about my campus sessions in more detail. We threw around some ideas for project management, because I need somebody to come in to manage this project from A-Z to help develop training materials, look at the manuals, and do the things that have been recommended to us. We threw around some ideas for a project manager like temporary help or maybe getting some graduate students from the School of Business involved as an assistantship or an internship. I also followed up with Dean Morris on May 5th, and we discussed graduate students, internships and management. He's going to put me in touch with the right faculty member for that. Our next steps are to get a project management person identified so they can walk this project from A-Z, bring it to the finish line, develop project objectives and a timeline, and whoever does the project will need to coordinate with business graduate students if we bring some of them on board. They can help with the development of training, instructions, and forms. We also need to coordinate with our information technology team on campus to look at the best technology we have available to use for this project.

K. Meksem asked about a timeline for getting this resolved. VC Simmers stated I need to identify someone who can manage the project for me and then I can set a timeline and a project plan.

F. VP Gireesh Gupchup and Director Todd Wakeland: International Travel Policy

T. Wakeland stated I'm the Director of Export Controls. We're here today to talk about International Travel Policy - international travel policies required by law by the federal government. We reviewed the International Travel Policy, and we gave a draft to you guys last year. The Provost has reviewed it, Deans' Council has approved it, General Counsel's Office has approved it - everyone we could think of

has reviewed it and okayed it. It was on the calendar for last month to be passed by the Board of Trustees. At that time, it was passed, however, we had some questions and concerns from Faculty Senate on the policy and possibly the procedures. So, we came down here today to answer any questions you had regarding the policy or the written procedures that were put in place to implement the policy.

R. Auxier stated I appreciate you coming down here to handle this. To what extent risk management controls the movements and the freedom of not only faculty but also staff and students? There's an argument that you guys have been employing, essentially it says that if risk management requires "X," then "X" shall be done. I think that we all understand the importance of what you do. You're protecting the university from all kinds of nasty things that can happen. It feels to me, and I'm not the only one, that you are extending your authority. So, for example, our movements during the summer when we are not on contract, there is vagueness about what it means to represent SIU. I think those issues absolutely have to be addressed in extremely specific ways. What authority do you have to demand knowledge of our movements when we are not representing SIU and especially when we are going back and forth between representing SIU and not representing SIU? Anything that you do has to be negotiated in collective bargaining. That affects our teaching mission and the other things that faculty do, like research. These things are also a part of our academic freedom and so therefore, they involve the Faculty Senate. This assumption that risk management can just assert its generalized authority and cite federal or state law is not an adequate argument. We are employees of the state with a union. We are represented. You are management. Anything that you want to impose on us, and it includes these international travel guidelines, needs to go through the collective bargaining agreement, and it needs the consent of the Faculty Senate. And I feel that, and it's not just me, this stage of the process has been neglected in the last couple of years as policies have come down from risk management, and I do not feel that our central administration has been adequately sensitive to protecting us from overreach of management. Because after all, risk management is management. We are an organized labor unit, and you are management. And so, you need to talk with us about policies of this kind. I hope I haven't sounded too negative or too harsh.

T. Wakeland stated we did notify the union, and we negotiated with the union on all campuses regarding the policy. They accepted the policy with very minor changes. So, the union has accepted it, and it's moved on from the union. When you spoke about us protecting the university, that is part of our job, however, the other part of our job is to protect you from something that you have no idea what you're doing about or that you're breaking the law. We're not risk management, we're Export Controls, but we're part of the research organization. The research organization, the regulations that they have to deal with on a weekly basis that are changing, that you are required to know about, that you sign off on when you do research contracts, some of those things that's what we're here to protect you from. We've had three incidents in the last year and a half at Carbondale that could have turned into some big issues legally, federally, and regarding research that we've been able to stop because faculty did not know about those issues or those problems that they were having. We were able to stop them before they became an issue. Why the new policy? It's federal regulations. I can't help that. It's new federal regulations. It's new law; we're required to do these things now. We are a Research One institution. Research One institutions need to have research one research management, and that means more regulations unfortunately. And that means things that you may not like that you have to do. But in order to get that grant, in order to get that money from the federal government, we're going to have to do them. So, we've gone through the process of talking to every single office that we think had a had an issue with this or could have had an issue with the policy, including Faculty Senate. We sent it to you guys last year. We asked for questions. We asked for changes. We didn't receive any questions or changes that were relevant. We went to the union, we went to legal, we went to Provost, the Chancellor's Office, anybody that wanted to see the policy has seen the policy and had a chance to review it and comment on it.

R. Auxier stated as I recall, we had a very inconclusive discussion about it. Our Faculty Senate President (Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee) was not given permission to speak at the last Board of Trustees'

meeting. He was denied permission to speak. YT Lee stated I tried to plan to speak up. I think I talked to the Chair of the committee, and I think there was no time, so I passed a message of concerns to him.

T. Wakeland stated I can't control what the board of trustees does or who they want to talk at the Board of Trustees' meeting. I don't run them. They were given every opportunity to have whoever they wanted to speak at the meeting. That is not something I control. Where we're at is that the policy has been passed. And so, there's not much we can do about the policy itself. We have written procedures that we're willing to talk to you about and how it processes through your departments and individuals and things like that. We've provided those to you last week, I think.

VP Gupchup stated one of the things that Randall asked about is when faculty are in contract and off contract. So, maybe Todd we can explain the issue of representation when they're off contract and go on vacation. You're not looking for that information, right? T. Wakeland stated, sure. So, I guess the key for the policy is when you're representing SIU. If you're on vacation, nobody cares where you go/what you do, it's when you're representing SIU. It's not a really complicated definition. If your conference name tag says SIU on it, you're representing SIU. If you're going for a research visit, if you're going to talk to a fellow researcher in another country, you're representing SIU. That's what we're concerned about, it is not your personal business or where you're going on your personal time.

L. Fredrickson stated so, if I'm in an archive in Paris and I'm looking through articles or something like that and sort of general research, am I representing SIU if I have no name tag? T. Wakeland stated, "No."

VP Gupchup stated there are four levels of countries that the federal government has designated. So, there's the first three levels of permissible travel. Level 4 countries are non-permissible travel countries - countries I think there's examples here like Sudan or Afghanistan. Some of these countries the federal government has designated them. If you were to travel there, there's a process to appeal for extenuating circumstances. So, then you can go through a process to appeal and then you enter that in Terra Dotta.

R. Auxier stated there are some of us who spend so much time abroad that we're going to just have to talk to you, like case by case, in order to work this out. The problem is a question of the relationship between this idea of representing SIU and the idea of moving independently when we are abroad, because those things interact with one another quite a lot. It's not all that easy to say when I am and am not representing SIU. The reason that this is important is because if you have a policy not perfectly congealed with your procedures, and that's where my concern is, and I don't think they currently do, then there's all kinds of space there for things to get messed up, and I feel that you should have had this conversation with us before now. We shouldn't be having this conversation after this thing was passed. Now that it already is passed, trust is not where it needs to be because we don't understand what you're telling us what we have to do or why. This isn't your fault, I understand. But we needed to be consulted, and we need to talk to our constituencies. That's what the Faculty Senate is for. We need to talk to our constituency so we can explain to them what it is they're going to have to do.

K. Meksem stated I fully agree with R. Auxier said. So, normally you send us something we should take time and analyze it and basically vote on it. And here we felt like you just sent us something, here is the information, and that's it; we really don't care about your opinion, and that's what my colleague is referring to. I would state, please, next time if you want us to help and be an active member of this university, get us involved. Don't shoot us an e-mail and expect, oh, they have information now, because we are part of this university, and if we do exist, it's because we have to be consulted on several things. And I'm looking forward to reinstating this order, because it has been completely disrespected for many, many years. So, the Faculty Senate and I will express again what my colleague said and my opinion is that we were thrown an e-mail there without any looking forward to our input. That's very, very bad. We don't have an issue with policies that serve everybody. I even went there and looked at it, because I will be traveling overseas. But there are

some other things you provide us with guidelines, but I can tell you a lot of things that you don't provide. And I'm always surprised, even here in the U.S., when I go and present at the university, I want to rent a car. So, the university does not allow me to actually put that rental for the insurance for the car on the P-Card, so I had to reimburse it. So, if you are really looking after our good, then you should be looking after our good for everything.

T. Wakeland stated I understand that. I appreciate your concerns, and I hear you. We have nothing to do with rental cars or whatever SIU departments do. We're concerned specifically with international travel with Export Controls. A lot of the questions that you have maybe have to do with the Risk Office itself regarding insurance and car rentals. Randall to answer your questions, again we did come here last year. We came here twice in a week, presented ourselves in person, and provided copies of the policy. It may have been a mistake for us to not get back to you, and we will learn from that in the future. However, again, the union was involved, the union saw the policy, negotiated the policy with legal counsel and with us, and they passed it. Sounds like some feelings have been hurt.

K. Meksem stated there is a difference between Faculty Association which is a union, and Faculty Senate. So, we have to make that difference clear. When you deal with the Faculty Association, you're dealing with them. When you deal with the Faculty Senate, you're dealing with us. T. Wakeland stated, sure, I understand that. It sounds like there's some underlying issues between what's going on here that we seem to be stuck in the middle of. I'm sorry that happened. I will do better in the future to notify you of any policies that are coming through, and in fact, you're going to see policies probably two or three policies, new policies over the next year, year and a half that are going to come out of research, because research is being diluted with new regulations and new laws almost daily.

G. Young stated there's an underlying issue that's been brought up with what is representation of the university? Laurel mentioned if I'm in an archive in Paris looking for research and I have to give my university credentials to access that resource, that's one thing. Randy is in Poland right now; he has a Saluki's hat on. What is representing the university? T. Wakeland stated it's going to be a tough situation. There are always examples of examples that are different than what we thought it would be. I would say if you're not sure that you're representing SIU, give us a call, and we can talk about it.

YT Lee stated I think there's three issues here. Number one, the effectiveness of shared governance and communication. I know that last year Todd Wakeland came to the Faculty Senate meeting in July. We sent out the discussion on this policy, and we collected input from the faculty. As Todd acknowledged, he did not get back to us before presenting to the Board of Trustees. It would be better for the Faculty Senate to have a discussion before the Board meeting, rather than afterwards. Second, the issue of representing SIU and then faculty/individual's rights and freedom, which is a big concern. And now in this situation, representing SIU is very vague. And third, we have to understand the difference between policy and procedure. We really hope that Todd Wakeland will help us to have a specific guideline and procedures to protect our faculty members rather than just one side.

G. Dr. Wesley Calvert: DFW report

W. Calvert stated I sent yesterday (with the distribution of materials) two documents. They are follow-ups on the document that I presented to you back in December. In December, among many recommendations that I gave you was to extend our charge for this semester so that we could follow up on a couple of things, and I'm now ready to tell you about them. The first one, the document is titled, "DFW Gap Analysis." The idea of this one is that different courses are different. And that makes a degree of sense pedagogically. But when you start looking at numbers across the whole university, that's important to keep in mind. And it's important to drill into some. I should mention on this, Dr. Kishore Joseph from Agriculture did the lion's share on this one. He did an enormous amount of programming, enormous amount of industry calls, data wrangling, and a whole bunch of the work to put this together. One of the directions of thinking is there shouldn't be a penalty for teaching students that need it. If you've been in the K12 education world, you've seen that before in various guises. And there are lots of ways that students might need it a little bit more. Maybe their background in this particular area is weaker. Student characteristics of various kinds predict

something, but not everything. If you are accustomed to natural sciences, the predictive values of our models are going to seem shocking low to you. That's actually good. You do not want a person's demographics and background to be total destiny. That is not the kind of university we are. We try to give opportunities to people, but they do actually predict something, and so, if you have a course that has a lot of students that are going to have trouble, your course is going to have more trouble than most courses. There's also difference in the content of the course is independent of the students. One of our informants we described interviewing in the previous report told us math isn't philosophy; a math course isn't a philosophy course. The format of the course, whether it's online, in person, or hybrid - that matters. The level of a course matters. And all of these things matter jointly. None of these things are independent in terms of their effect on student success. So, what we did in the report that you have, we took all of these things (the student characteristics as far as we could get them from university data, the content of the courses classified by UCC division, and the format of the course). We took it all and tried to make predictions of student success. And we tried to make predictions for courses. What's the DFW rate likely to be in this course based just on what you can predict from what students are in it and what kind of class it is. The big bottom line of this report is that we should be looking not at raw DFW rate. We should be looking at how much DFW rate in a course differs from the prediction, and we actually did name names on courses. One of our reality checks was ok, I know the math courses a little bit. I've been an undergraduate Program Director there for a while. OK, the math courses that show up, do those make sense to me? And it was a useful mixture of surprises that could be explained once I thought about them a little bit. And that suggested to me that we were getting good, actionable information there. So, that is the DFW Gap Analysis Report. The second report that I sent you was a survey. It's called DFW Survey Report. There we applied a lesson that I have seen several times in my classes. I've seen it as Scout Master. I've seen it in a number of places. The lesson is, when in doubt, ask a student. On this, Professor Oliver Keys Jr. and Dr. Shannon M. McCrocklin took the lead on this project. Oliver especially did a lot of the work of putting together a survey that would get us valuable information, getting it distributed, and coding the answers so that we would get something out of it except a bunch of idiosyncratic one-off answers from students. The details you have in the report - I wanted to point out some of the big items there. One of the things that is no surprise, but it's important information, non-class personal struggles are huge. If you know Maslow's hierarchy, if somebody's world is melting down, they are not going to be getting an A in their class right at that moment, and they told us that in the survey. Non-cognitive issues about effective engagement in classes - those are big. Are they motivated in the class? Are they putting in the work? Many of them told us, look, I just didn't put in the work on that class that I needed to. That is a part of the picture and maybe training them to do what they need to do, figuring out a way to address some of those affective or non-cognitive issues is going to have to be part of what we do here. The students did mention instruction quality issues. They mentioned unclear expectations. They mentioned a lack of respect. And what respect we have for them is an independent thing, maybe from what respect they see from us and the respect they see from us matters. Access to materials was an issue. If they missed a class, could they find out what happened in that class? If they had some disability issue that interfered with the way the instructor had imagined they might get information - Was there a way around it? We picked up some of that ability to make up absences was an issue, and that ties in, as you can imagine, with some of the non-class personal struggles. One thing that came through really loudly and again reality perception tracks what matters to the students and what they say is sticking them up - they are begging us to care about their success. They also recognize when we ask them what is working for them - the things they point out there are the times when they knew that their instructors cared and were supporting them. They mentioned issues with pacing, with materials, with multiple paths to learning, and access to tutors. Some of this is actual availability and some of it, like us caring about it, some of it's real and some of it's us communicating effectively, which we're supposed to be professionals in. They have family and work responsibilities. And we were getting responses that suggest those had tendency to be brushed off. And if you get deeply into the mindset, I came up as a traditional student at a small selective private institution where essentially everybody was a traditional student and everybody had a certain amount of financial wherewithal. If you're thinking in that mode, you're missing what are the realistic conditions for your students to succeed in classes.

They mentioned, and this stood out to me because it is so in keeping with what we've seen in pedagogical literature from a couple of different fronts (student success, cheating, a bunch of other things) - they say avoid concentrating the grade on a small number of assessment points. They mentioned to us a lack of advisors. You have the full report, and I recommend that you read it because it is eye opening, and it turns our attention to where it needs to be to help our students succeed. These two investigations are what we'd ask the extra semester for, and you now have them.

Provost Tucker stated I want to start by thanking the (DFW) Committee. They did a tremendous amount of work on the DFW concerns, and I greatly appreciate that. I actually did read through the reports today. Far exceeded the charge in what I was expecting, but I do want to know, will Faculty Senate now take up their report and potentially pass those recommendations? Because that's what I'm looking for in next steps is that you discuss this as a body, and if you agree with what this committee has put forward then that gives me direction of next steps. K. Meksem stated I fully agree with you. Actually, the report is overwhelming and there are a lot of conclusions there that could help our students and could help actually guide our university. How do we want to move next? I will be consulting with the Faculty Senate and find out how we'll move with this report. And of course, we'll be looking forward to listening from you -How would you like us to move with it? And we'll come up with a formula how we can move up with recommendations and endorsing some of the stuff in this report.

R. Auxier stated I wanted to congratulate Wesley and his committee. It really is a great report. What I would like to suggest, and this is in line with what Provost Tucker says, is that perhaps members of the Faculty Senate should make an effort to meet with their constituencies to talk about this. In other words, when our Deans and our school Chairs and the various groups that we represent pull the faculty together, I wonder if somebody from your committee could be present. Because in order to implement what Provost Tucker is talking about, I think there needs to be a stage where this is discussed with all the faculty (NTTs and everybody) so that we can go through your data. Obviously, all of us have seen all sorts of complaints that students always lodge when they're not doing well, but I believe that your report successfully goes beyond just that, because your analysis was so good. There are some things that we can learn from there. But the question is what is the next step? I would strongly suggest that in the fall we schedule a series of meetings and I realize that your committee has already done so much work, but if you could send people who were actually looking at that data and talking to those students, you could send them to us so that we can sort of get beneath the surface of the report to find out how it applies to us in our various units. That's just my recommendation.

W. Calvert stated I'm happy to facilitate communication with the people that have been on the committee that have authored these reports. I think that we are likely to be able to work something out for somebody to come talk to whoever wants to talk with us about this stuff. I think we're all invested in these reports. We would like to see it actually turn into action at the level of actual students doing well in actual classes, so I think we're all generally on board with that. I'm happy to facilitate communications and get you who you need for what you need it for.

D. Johnson stated I just wanted to thank Wesley and the committee. It really is a marvelous report. I've been around long enough to see previous DFWI reports and they're child's play compared to this. Someone who teaches some of these courses it would be nice to kind of incorporate the various things we've heard today, in terms of what we're doing for these at-risk students with the low high school GPAs. I'm not quite clear exactly what they're going to be required to do this summer, for example. I also think ideally it would be having a conversation that included assessment along with DFWI. When I think about how I could improve the DFWI rates in my class, the easiest way to do it would be by ways that probably results in scoring worse on a legitimate assessment machine. I'm actually thinking about one of the things that I think someone suggested - a lot of low-stake assignments. But I have a lot of students who just don't do them. And if I drop those low stake assignments and just let them take a couple of tests, I can see my way to passing them. But if they haven't done 20% of the class then they fail.

YT Lee stated I definitely agree. This committee did a fantastic job. W. Calvert stated we are looking to see whether the two reports we presented to you at this meeting, whether there's an academic paper in one or both of those. But as a committee, we have completed our work. I really want to see these recommendations getting to the level of students that would not have succeeded to actually succeeding.

K. Meksem stated I really would like to give time to our faculty to read your report and get familiarized with it. Then we'll invite you for our next meeting to get some input directly from you. And we'll be also looking forward to an e-mail from Provost Tucker about this report, and then hopefully, we can adopt some of the stuff that came from it as recommendations to the university to move on with adopting some of the good stuff from there. Thank you very much.

H. Dr. Lichang Wang, FAC IBHE rep. – (no report)

I. Dr. Mark Peterson, Graduate Council rep.

M. Peterson stated the 2024-2025 Grad. Council has concluded its activities for the year. We did have an organizational meeting for our 2025-2026 Council, and we had elections. Professor Kelly Bender will be the Chair for the 2025-2026 Grad. Council and the Vice Chair will be Dr. Iraklis Anagnostopoulos.

XI. Adjournment

Motion: H. Wang

Second: J. Remo