

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

I. Call to Order: Khalid Meksem

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

II. Roll Call: John Farrish

Present: Nwamaka Anaza, Gary Apgar, Randall Auxier, Erica Blumenstock, Lingguo Bu, Lavern Byfield, Kwangho Cho, John Farrish, Erin Hascup, Timothy Hurley, Ghassan Ishak, David M.

Johnson, Seung-Hee Lee, Sarah Lewison, Jia Liu, Khalid Meksem, Katie Moore, Cinzia Padovani,

Shelly Page, Kaitlyn Poirier, Jun Qin, Jonathan Remo, Nicole Roberts, Mohtashim Shamsi, Jennifer Sherry, Ahmed Torky, Jennifer Walker, Haibo Wang, Christopher Wienke, Geoffrey Young

Absent: Christopher Chiasson, Frances T. Lee, Cassie Wagner (proxy Marissa Ellermann)

Guests: Iraklis Anagnostopoulos, Jebaraj Asirvatham, Kelly Bender, Hannah Connolly, Julie Dunston, Craig Engstrom, Rachel Frazier, Shelly Gehrke, Jeff Harmon, Melissa Laake, Austin Lane, Jessica Mann, Kimberli Morgan, Katelyn Petrolina, Lydia Phelps, Jeffrey Punske, David Shirley, Erin Stumpf, Constantinos Tsatsoulis, Sheryl Tucker, Juliane Wallace, Lichang Wang, Kristin Wolek

III. Approval of Minutes from July 15, 2025

Motion: J. Remo

Second: D. M. Johnson

A vote commenced: 25 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The minutes from July 15, 2025, were approved as presented.

IV. President's Report: Khalid Meksem

K. Meksem stated before we start the meeting our agenda is full for today, and I'm expecting it to be full for the next meeting, so that's why we have set expectations for the meetings. Please always state your name. If you are serving on a committee, state the name of that committee. If you are Chair or Co-Chair of a committee, state that. Please provide your report for the meeting ahead of time. Do not bring your report to the meeting and then you expect us to be able to discuss it or understand what you're going to be talking about, ok? Follow the time that you are given. If you are given 2 minutes, it's really 2 minutes, because we have a full agenda, and we need everybody to respect their time. If extra time is needed, then we can actually take it to the end if everybody agrees to stay.

V. Vice President's Report: Jennifer Sherry

A. "Send Proof" link for course evaluations – meeting with Dir. Craig Engstrom (Senators should be prepared to vote at October's meeting.)

J. Sherry stated a big thank you to Melissa Laake for her help with the committee lists and emails that have been sent out. We are so lucky to have her expertise with us daily. The Committee on Committees are working to fill open seats and they will report on their work shortly. Some university committees have open seats and Melissa and I have worked to gain updated faculty lists so the call for volunteers may be secured. I have sent a paragraph for all Faculty Senators to take back to your constituents and discuss thoughts on the "Send Proof" link for ICE evaluations on D2L and would request a consensus by our October Faculty Senate meeting. I will inform Craig Engstrom from CTE the vote so we can move forward for fall 2025 semester. Khalid Maxim, John Farish, Melissa Laake and I met with the Faculty Senate Committee Chairs and Co-chairs to form lists of priorities for all the committees to focus on for

the upcoming year and semester. That was a very productive meeting, and I appreciate everybody's time and attention today.

VI. Moment of Silence for late Faculty: Alicia Cremeens & Dr. Scott Comparato

K. Meksem stated as you know this year, we lost two of our colleagues, Professor Alicia Cremeens and Professor Scott Comparato. They were both members of our community. To honor their lives and they've given to our university, I would like to observe a moment of silence for our late faculty. *(Moment of silence was held.)*

VII. Invited Guests:

A. Chancellor Lane

Chancellor Lane stated I hope you have had a great couple of weeks. I want to give a big thank you to all of the faculty and all of the staff over the last couple of weeks and actually over the last year to help us get to where we are with our enrollment. It definitely takes a team effort. Those of you that were here between 2015 and 2020, you remember those reports where we lost around 6,000 students at the university, and I'm sure you had some pretty creative meetings during those times. We've been able to work together over the last few years to really turn that around. We are celebrating being flat, but let me go into a little bit of detail. *(A PowerPoint slide was shared on the screen titled, "Fall 2025 Enrollment & Retention Highlights.")* I want to cover a few enrollment highlights. So, believe it or not, internally we keep a different number that's reported from the 10th class day, because our folks work so hard that it's important to find out what they yield from the applications that they received. So, we actually registered 11,884 students. Unfortunately, down the stretch within those 10 days, you have students that have to withdraw for personal reasons, financial reasons. They don't always get to the 11th class day, because there's an issue. Some defer them (their enrollment) to the spring. Some decide that for whatever reason they need to move on. So, we still celebrate that number. We have a few late starts that are in play. I think the deadline there is October 17th. We are watching how many students actually register during the late start period. We fully expect to even exceed that 11,785 number and we'll come and give an update there. We are having a campus celebration on October 1st. Hopefully, everyone can come out and enjoy some BBQ and get a thank you from us. Overall, student enrollment highlights 3% growth in graduate students - hats off Dr. Tsatsoulis, Dr. Karen Jones, and the whole team there; they did a fantastic job. You can look at some of the percentages there for our master's students, our doctoral students - those are very important increases in those areas. 23% growth in the online enrollment - that's a big piece that we talked about a couple of years ago that we wanted to move the needle on. We know we've got folks out there looking to take classes online - have some success there. I'll skip down to the increase in students from Kentucky, Missouri and Indiana; those are strategic increases. Again, the target states that are bordering us to make sure that we got some of those students back. Many of you remember when we had the budget impasse, many of our students left and went to those states, because we didn't have the MAP Grants and other things to keep our students here at home. So, that seems to be turning around. Overall demographic increases, as you can see, our largest increase 10% increase in Hispanic students, 9% Asian, 4% Two or More Races, 2% Black students, 4% Female. Big increase that we are really excited about is the Southern Illinois regional increase; it went up about 6.1%. So, for all the faculty, I know Dr. Sherry, Dr. Pond and others came out to those high schools back in the spring with the Saluki Southern Illinois Takeover. You see the results, right? They're there. This morning, we were talking with all the superintendents and principals right over at the Student Center earlier today. They're fired up to send us even more students. So, we had some really good discussions with them this morning - gave them a big thank you. Obviously, we wouldn't be where we are without those individuals. Those relationships are going a long way, so we want to keep those going. New

student enrollment highlights again, we talked about the 6% growth there, 51% increase in New Graduate Online students. Again, that's a market that we're really targeting. Moving to retention, our continuing student enrollment highlights as it relates to retention - this is really a hats off to a lot of the folks who spend their time really making sure our students get from orientation to graduation. So, you have your recruitment and retention coordinators, your counselors, your advisors, faculty members, all the folks that are chipping in to make sure that our students actually register. We're excited about the 5% increase of all continuing students. There's a 4% increase in students who continue to enroll from southern Illinois. That's important about how many of those students we keep there. So, you can see the list. I won't keep reading on and on, but very excited about the retention work that we're putting in place to launch for this fall to save even more students. We've had lots of meetings, lots of discussions, and we have some things that we're putting in place that we think are going to really help us in that regard. Our overall credit hours registered - that's really what you want to look at, because that's how you're essentially paid. It is the number of credit hours that students are taking. It's not so much the headcount in our state. We don't have that formula that pays you on headcount Dr. Page like we would in Texas with some of those formulas there where you really get paid with that headcount number. In our case, it's essentially what we do in our credit hours that students are registering in. So, we have really pushed the 15 to finish out of the Provost Office. That message is getting around, and I think people are really excited about that. Our growth or decline by academic areas - if you want a flavor of what we're doing as it relates to each of our schools, the schools that are up, COBA was up 7.8%. Hats off to them. Our College of Health and Human Sciences was up 2.2%. And then you can see the other percentages of our schools that had some slight decreases with the exception of COLA, but the others had some pretty slight decreases, and we expect to have some discussions with our Deans, with the Provost, with VC Wendell Williams and others to look at some ways that we can increase that number in those areas and bring in more enrollment in that regard. This is a public document. You're welcome to have it. Dr. Maxim, I will send it to you. You are free to share this wherever you would like to share it. If you need additional information, we can get that information as well.

B. Provost Tucker

Provost Tucker stated I wanted to highlight and thank everybody for the work they did. You can see this is an overview of the My Textbook program. We had an expected participation rate of about 71%, saving students on average \$240. So, that's extraordinary when you look at it overall; the savings were roughly \$2 million for our students. So, I want to give you an update and also a reminder, because the textbook deadline for spring, I know it doesn't sound like it, but spring registration is right around the corner, that is September 15th. I'm hoping we're going to see over a 90% adoption rate in terms of having things turned in and ready to go for our students when they enroll, because that is what the federal regulations are. We are also doing early alerts via the Slate system this year. So, if you get a request for early alerts on students, please fill that out. There are certain populations that we request as well as any student, and those will start going out in the next week or so. Once we hit that 4th week, we do like 4, 8 and 12 to make sure that students are going to class, that they're participating, that they're turning in assignments, and then our advisors and R & Rs will be following up if there are concerns. The majority of my time I wanted to spend on the resolution that came from the Undergraduate Student Government. So, you received their resolution as well as the registrar's background on a policy change for what they originally called Dead Week. That's common terminology; we were looking at "Quiet Week." The process for such is that the registrar does the research; she sends that to me. If I'm supportive, I sign off on it, it goes to Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, etc., and comes before you. So, that policy has come before you for endorsement to consider Dead Week or "Quiet Week" would be our case. It shows you

the background information as well as other schools with similar policies. And in this case, I know one of the questions was what if we don't have a traditional cumulative final? That is fine. If you don't, we can slightly modify the policy. I did speak with the leadership of our Undergraduate Student Government, as well as our Student Trustee yesterday. They are fine with the example given where they do in Comm 101, they do their 4th speech that last week. That's not an issue. They don't do a traditional final, but it's really to give not only our students time to prepare for their finals coming up so that no major assignment is due that last week, as well as, the students are mentioning quite a bit that many faculty do not have their grades available to them going into finals. So, this also gives faculty time to make sure that students have the grades on the assignments to date. Advisors have a really hard time helping students when there are no grades available to those students - sometimes for the entire term, sometimes for the last major assignment. So that was the crux of that resolution.

C. VCR/Dean of Graduate School: Constantinos Tsatsoulis

VCR Tsatsoulis shared his screen of a PowerPoint presentation titled, "OVCR and Grad School Update September 9, 2025." VCR Tsatsoulis stated this is the new student orientation a couple of weeks ago. These are some of our new graduate students. I wanted to talk to you a little bit about our graduate enrollment. As of the 10th day of classes, we had 2,732. That's an increase of, as the Chancellor said, about 3%. We're up 13 students and doctoral students. That's really good as we continue to be an R1 university. But more than that, just raise in the R1 category. What's also good is we had 102 new PhD students, which is up 12 from last year. And as you'll see, that's especially good given the drop in our international enrollments. The master's students are also up, and Med Prep students are exactly the same. Our domestic yield was 71.1%. The yield is the number of students who were admitted, and we then enrolled. Our international yield was only 17%, and that was excluding US-based international students. Fifty of them were already in the US. I don't count them, because they may already have had a visa or might have been even our student with a visa. That's a very low yield. But this morning I was looking, and we have a great increase in our international students for spring. And as a matter of fact, the admission rate for these students is over 80%. Now, given that we are in the beginning of September, I would tend to believe that these are students who were admitted for the fall and had to defer (because of visa issues) their admission in the spring. It will be interesting to see what an international graduate enrollment looks in the spring, because I think there were a lot of deferrals. So, here's the enrollment specifically for international students over the years. Maroon is the "new students" and dark gray is the "continuing students." 2021 was a bad year. It was right after the pandemic, and you can see a continuous increase and a drop this year. The drop is because of the non-continuing students, but that's because they graduated, and that's a good thing. But also, we had a 30-student loss from new students. As I said, I hope that this will correct itself in the spring. Funded research in parentheses is last fiscal year and this is very specific for SIU Carbondale; it does not include Springfield. We're down in the number of requested funds. We're down quite a bit, almost 20% in awarded funding, but we're up in expenditures. Some of the drops are explained by the fact that for months in this calendar year, funding agencies stopped issuing grants, stopped issuing requests for proposals - a lot of requests for proposals had been posted, were removed and also there were no review panels for quite a few months. You may have remembered NIH and NSF - there was no travel allowed. There were no panels. We are seeing that starting to correct itself as the federal agencies come up with their new priorities, and I expect that this will be corrected in the future. But right now, these are the numbers for fiscal 2025. All these numbers just every month of proposals, awards, expenditures with agencies, PI's and so on, are on the OSPA website, and they're accessible only through the SIU accounts.

D. Center for Teaching Excellence Director: Craig Engstrom (D2L Course Inactivation & Deletion Policy draft)

Dir. Engstrom stated I hope your semester is off to a great start. I just want to send a shout out to all the faculty. There was a lot of professional development that happened this fall; it was a great turn out. We received very good and positive comments about it. So, if you do hear any feedback, please always send it to me, because I'm always eager to keep improving the Center and improve faculty engagement. Today, I am here to talk about a policy implementation. And just to give a little bit of a background, when I started in the position about 3.5 years ago, a question came up from JP Dunn and I said, well, what's the policy say? And he said, well, we don't have any policies. So, SIU has never had an LMS policy in place, which is a problem. We've had a variety of committees working on different aspects of an LMS policy. So, for example, the Communication Committee came up with some of the guidelines for what should be posted in the LMS. And over the past year, as you're aware, the amount of e-mail blasts going out to students has reduced. So, we're focusing only on communications that are relevant to students and their performance in classes. That's just an example of it. The CTE Advisory Council has been currently working on the current one that I'm here to talk to you about today. I'm just going to present this as the problem solution. So again, we have no data retention policy for the LMS, which is an audit risk. Courses in D2L Brightspace date back now to 2010. This causes issues with data quality. So, for example, if I run a report, it's saying that the less time students spend in D2L, the higher the grade they will have, which is not accurate. So, we have issues, because we don't have any cleanup there. Systems performance - we were actually reached out to by D2L because we started having some instability in the instance, and we said what's going on here? Their recommendation was to inactivate some courses, which we had to do pretty immediately. And then obviously like security, if we have all of these courses out there, then if there ever were a data breach or something, there would be bigger issues with that affecting more users and so forth. So, that's just an example of some of the issues. Probably the biggest one that keeps me up at night is that the D2L contract actually stipulates a 500 megabyte per user data storage limitation. We currently have about 11.8 FTE on our contract. That's full time equivalent for the calculation. And any overage is \$3 per gigabyte annually for data overage. Some LMSs, I think Blackboard is sort of notorious for this, has sent bills to its clients for data overage. This is not a stipulation that's specific. In fact, it exists for all of our contracts that have - so even Microsoft will have data limitations. Storage is getting more expensive. Google just hit a bunch of universities with a bunch of data restrictions, just as an example. So, this is something that's in the forefront of mine. Not only that, D2L is dropping a lot of hints that they are eager or desire their clients to sort of take proactive measures to start being proactive about removal of redundant courses and so forth. So, our solution then was to come up with a policy. And as policies come out that are not related to this, but other ones we will always be coming to the various councils. We presented this at GPSC for example, they didn't have really any questions about it. But our policy would recommend and should be three years inactivation. What this means is that courses after three years from when they were offered will be simply inactivated. That just means that they are no longer in the menu, but they can still be copied from semester to semester, and then finally a deletion after five years. This is right in line with other schools. So, I asked all of the chief online learning officers around the state. That's about where they're at - Arizona and Georgia State system have a five-year policy; they are D2L Brightspace users. And then just in comparison, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville has a four-semester deletion; they are a Blackboard campus. As I said, Blackboard is more aggressive, and so they delete their courses after four semesters. So, in the 5th semester they delete and just get rid of all their courses that are in the LMS. It is the responsibility at all of these institutions for instructors to download their course packages. No university that I've reached out to was backing them up for faculty, again, because of data storage issues. If you need to retain your course package, you would export it yourself. Of course, we are working on all the documentation to explain all of this, to provide guidance for how to download stuff, to provide help and support for all the

other things that have been in the LMS that shouldn't have been there in the first place. So, for example, a lot of graduate committees were storing applications and so on. I do have for you all to look at, provide commentary on a communication that we'd like to send out to everybody explaining this and that's why I'm going to drop it in the in the chat. If you have any comments, concerns or questions on that, I would invite you to e-mail teach@siu.edu to share that.

E. University Core Curriculum Director: Jeffrey Punske (HLC Compliance & Core Curriculum)

J. Punske stated I'm here to talk about our HLC focus visit. There are two areas of concern that were brought up. The first was the 400-500 split that I'm sure many of you heard about, especially those of you with graduate programs. And there were also some major concerns about our assessment practices within UCC. The HLC is requiring that we have a completed map of our essential learning outcomes for the UCC as part of this focus visit. UCC follows the LEAP criteria. This is a very standard criteria used across the various different universities, which gives us four different essential learning outcomes, each of which map to 16 different student learning outcomes at various ways. It's not even split group of student learning outcomes to essential learning outcomes. And so, what HLC wants to see is a mapping of our core categories to the essential learning outcomes. We have a serious problem, insofar as we do not have a mapping, nor can we create such a mapping easily under our current practices and structure. For instance, we have our 4th essential learning outcome - integrative learning is currently represented by less than 2% of UCC classes in the assessment plans we have on file; that translates to roughly 4 classes, over well around 250 courses. This is an opportunity for us to revise the core, which hasn't happened in quite a long time. Our UCC has fallen behind our peers in terms of its structure, its offerings and things like that. So, this is an opportunity for us to move forward, but we'd have to move quickly. The Core Curriculum Executive Council is currently working on a revised proposal. I'll find out on Thursday where they are with that. We'll be meeting again later this month, and I hope to be able to have something no later than October to present to UEPC. By policy, Core Curriculum changes only need approval of UCC and UEPC. But I believe that any wider, larger scale revision should also come to the full Senate, but again, this is going to be a tight timeline. If we do not revise, we will have to implement a mapping on our current structure which will have to be imposed, because this is a requirement of our creditors. So, I'm here partially to ask that Faculty Senate take this very seriously and think about what they want from a UCC going forward.

F. Center for international Education Director: Peter Li - (no report)

G. Executive Director – Chief Marketing & Communications Officer: Jeff Harmon (update on university websites)

J. Harmon stated we have migrated 211 websites over to the new template. And we have 20 plus still in progress. All the college sites, thank goodness, are finally over except for CHHS, which is waiting for just a little bit more content from the college. We will get that up probably in a few days actually. We have a new project going on that I think you all would like. It's a faculty expert site or faculty profile page site. It's a new modern looking site that has a really nice layout, easier to use, and it will showcase faculty achievements and expertise more effectively, and also serve as an Expert Finder for media and campus partners. So, that'll make it easier for them to connect with you folks for interviews or collaborations or outreach or anything else. It'll be easier for you to use too, to update your own official faculty site. And you'll be able to put all your links in there to your personal sites that you've got outside of our servers, etc. And it will pull faculty profile pages off of the academic websites. So, it'll be sort of a separate entity, but linked to it in a more streamlined fashion. So, we are working really hard on SIU online's website right now. We realized that we really needed to showcase the necessary information to that target audience in a way that was more like what Risepoint is doing for us with the grad. programs and also the way ASU online or SNHU displays their information. They want to know about the convenience, when can they the next start date for

a course or ease of applying and support, and things like that. So, we're working really hard to mimic those proven content strategies on our own website, then we'll be able to be a lot more effective. So, as you saw from the Chancellor, we've already had a really good increase in online graduate and undergraduate, and I think we're looking forward to seeing this really help us with marketing those programs further. I'm excited about that. Then we also have a couple of things that might be useful for you. We had showcased some of our marketing strategies, videos, and collateral and things like that at a site that is *promote.siu.edu*, and that old site is still up, but within a week or two we're going to have a brand new, really sharp looking, easy-to-use site. I didn't like the old site - a little bit clunky. So, if you wonder what are they doing, how do they articulate my program in any way, you'll be able to see a lot of examples there. Soon, there'll be all sorts of new brand language on there, which I'd love to come back and talk to you all about if you'll give me the time sometime soon. And one more page that's going up soon is one for our enrollment management's "Say Yes" campaign, which is where we're pre-admitting students if they have a 2.75 or above grade point average. So, we'll call it "Say Yes," and the details of that will be on that particular page. So, we'll have that for you soon as well.

H. Q&A

R. Auxier, Chair of Governance Committee, stated to Provost Tucker I sent a memo to your office that I hadn't really got an answer on. During your report you referenced some things that were in the note that I sent, which was copied to our President, but I didn't get exact, well, clear enough answers. Are you asking us to undertake a study of the viability of a "Quiet Week?" **Provost Tucker** stated, no, I'm asking you to look at the USG resolution and the registrar's report on that potential policy change and make a decision whether you would support that or not. I think there's enough information there, and I did get your note, but I thought you wanted me to answer those questions for the broader audience. **R. Auxier** asked if UEPC has this resolution, because I don't have the student resolution. **Provost Tucker** stated the package was sent to Faculty Senate and Graduate Council as well. **R. Auxier** stated that may have been in a package I missed. So, you're only asking for an endorsement, you don't want us to study this? **Provost Tucker** stated no, I don't think it requires a study. If you look at what they have proposed and then the amendment I just talked about, that addressed the concern that you made and the number of other institutions that have done this historically and are doing that. I think we should be able to move on that versus taking a year to study it. **R. Auxier** stated ok, we'll discuss it.

K. Poirier from the Governance Committee asked if "Quiet Week" applies to the Graduate schools or are we just talking about the undergraduate schools? **Provost Tucker** stated thank you, that's a great question. It is from the Undergraduate Student Government. It is undergraduate only. Not only does it *not* apply to graduate, but also it does *not* apply to professional schools, so law and medicine.

D. M. Johnson stated I heard a discussion about flexibility in the policy. I haven't seen it in writing anywhere, so I'm concerned about what we're being asked to, I guess at some point vote on. And if it doesn't include some language about flexibility, it's going to get fewer votes. The question I have about just the language in the memo you sent to the Vice Chancellors or to the Vice Provost's - faculty could optionally use this time for review sessions - do you mean the faculty could in lieu of holding classes could do something else during that week or are you just saying that they can do that in addition, if they'd like? **Provost Tucker** stated no. So, a couple of things - the review sessions are during your class time and if you have a comprehensive final, and you want to use that as review time, that's a faculty decision. The chancellor and I and a few cabinet members met with our Undergraduate Student Government Officers yesterday, as well as our Student Board Member, I think Hannah may even be on the call, and we discussed the concern that Dr. Auxier put in his e-mail to me about

if you don't have a traditional cumulative final, can you have like a fourth speech due that week? And they all thought that was an easy policy update we could make, but I wanted to talk to you all first. We will definitely solidify that in writing to you. We will update the policy based on that feedback, but the students didn't have any concern, and they originated the resolution under our shared governance that includes our students as well. After today, I can update the policy after I get the feedback today with the registrar and then send it back.

S. Page stated my concern is voting on a policy that doesn't impact me as a professor. So, I would wonder, what do the undergraduate professors feel about this policy? Sounds like the students are overwhelmingly in support of it, but what would the professors who this will directly impact them, what are those thoughts? **Provost Tucker** stated you're the representative body, and that's why it's been brought forward to Faculty Senate.

C. Wienke stated how does this policy square with academic freedom with our discretion to determine what's best for our own courses, how we want to pace our courses, our scheduling, our course content? It seems to be a conflict here in my opinion. **Provost Tucker** stated I would disagree in terms of a university policy about how many weeks are in a semester, when our fall break is, how we do our finals, that to me is an institutional decision. That's why many institutions have this policy, and it is not seen as in conflict with academic freedom. **C. Wienke** stated but it's requiring less work during that week. **Provost Tucker** stated it's not. It's requiring you to think about the preparation of – **C. Wienke** stated, so we have to shove it further in the semester - we have to reorganize the semester because of this institutional policy. **Provost Tucker** stated I think we want to be doing is reorganizing our semesters to start with because of the student populations we're now serving and Dr. Maxim spoke to this. **C. Wienke** stated different than the previous student populations? **Provost Tucker** stated Dr. Meksem said very eloquently the other day that we need more frequent assignments, etc. so we can monitor how our students are doing and provide more frequent feedback. If you look at best practices, it has changed historically versus many of us had a midsemester exam and a cumulative final, and nothing else in between. And that is not best practice anymore.

R. Auxier stated it's going to take some time to find out whether the faculty supports this. I represent the entire College of Liberal Arts, and in order to make an intelligent vote, I have to consult with everybody in the College of Liberal Arts, and that's going to take me some time to figure that out, it's a process. We can't just as a Faculty Senate mow over the will of our faculty, and we don't necessarily know what their will is until we have time to look into it. That's why I favor studying it.

Provost Tucker stated I will say there are many things in front of you that I am waiting on - resolutions from Faculty Senate, and I would like to see some of these things come to fruition. The DFW policy, ICE - the surveys of instructor effectiveness, all those things are still waiting, and this is now another one. **K. Meksem** stated if I can ask you, please can you send me all these things that you're waiting for the Senate to approve, because I need to do a follow up on what we have already in the pipeline versus what we still have to vote on. And then the other thing, once you revise the "Quiet Week" policy, if you can please send it to me then I can forward it again to everybody on time, and then we can go over it, get some feedback. It might be that we need some amendments or some changes to certain things. This way we can get back to you with the feedback first and then once you're okay with the feedback and everybody's okay, then we can proceed to vote. **Provost Tucker** stated absolutely.

J. Sherry stated to Provost Tucker we actually have experienced some issues with online textbooks and access codes not being available. We're in week 4 now, and we still don't have

an answer from the bookstore on why the online student resources are not accessible on access codes within dental hygiene's textbooks? **APAP Dunston** stated she can follow up on that. **J. Sherry** stated I have contacted Carmen two or three times now and once in person and twice via text, and still my students do not have access codes with the online textbooks. **APAP Dunston** stated Chad Nale is the person I've been working directly with on the Follett Access Program. **Provost Tucker** asked if anyone else has heard of similar issues. **K. Poirier** from the Governance Committee stated yes, we're still without some books, physical copies of books, even at the law school at this point. **Provost Tucker** stated please send that to Julie Dunston. She will work with Follett. This is why the September 15th deadline is so important. I'm not saying that's went on here, but the initial problem students had almost all of them are because textbook adoptions were not turned in last spring. **J. Sherry** stated that's not the case here. This was more when they get the online textbooks - when they flip through it, it says place sticker here, instead of an access code. So, it's just missing. **Provost Tucker** stated I just want to make sure that people know that with this new program, Follett started bundling everything in beginning of August for our students. The digital ones are easier to manage and they're cheaper for the students as well. But part of what happened, particularly with physical textbooks, by the time Follett was notified, it was too late to get things on time. So, if you know of anything, please send those forward. Julie Dunston will funnel them. She and Tina Bennett have answered hundreds of emails, because this is the new program. It's a new rollout, but we really want to have this go very smoothly in spring, but take care of those issues that are still lingering for fall. The whole point of this was the students would have access to those books day one. **J. Walker** stated I teach in radiologic sciences, and I'm having the exact same problem with access codes that Jennifer Sherry was talking about in dental hygiene as well. **C. Engstrom** stated it's a little different than access codes, but one thing we've experienced is if there was a connector between a book and like say a MacMillan book, it now goes through like sort of a different route. So, just a recommendation for folks is to copy your courses earlier and then test the links before the semester starts. We'll try to get that information out way more in advance, but we learned that sort of as things were rolling out.

K. Meksem stated I have a reminder to everybody. You are Faculty Senators, so you do not have to wait until today if you have questions. So, please e-mail whoever the person you want to ask and copy me please.

VIII. I. Requests and concerns from Faculty Senate – (none)
Reports

A. Executive Committee: Chair, Khalid Meksem

1. Judicial Review Board officer election (James Condor resigned from JRB as of 8/1/25)

a. Approve new Chair: Dr. Liliana Lefticariu

The Executive Committee discussed the qualifications of the candidate and found that Dr. Liliana Lefticariu is qualified for the position (Chair), so we need to vote on her today.

Motion: C. Page

Second: J. Remo

A vote commenced: 28 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The new Chair of JRB (Liliana Lefticariu) was approved as presented.

2. Timothy Hurley will finish his Senate term SP27 (Benna Williams stepped down as Proxy).

3. Geoffrey Young stepped down from Budget Committee Chair.

K. Meksem stated David M. Johnson is our Budget Committee Chair. We will need to approve him today.

Motion: S. Lewison

Second: J. Remo

A vote commenced: 26 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. David M. Johnson was approved as presented to serve as the new Chair of the Budget Committee.

4. Jonathan Remo will be Chair of UEPC instead of Co-Chair (Yueh-Ting Lee left SIU).

B. Election Committee: Chair, Jennifer Sherry

1. Fill (3) Faculty Senate seats (Yueh-Ting Lee, Marissa Ellermann, & Daniel Bronke are no longer on Senate)

a. *Kang Sun* – School of Human Sciences will replace Yueh-Ting Lee's seat (term 2025-2026)

b. NTT Special Election (term 2025-2026)

J. Sherry stated the NTT Special Election is actually in process. Melissa Laake and I have been working on an updated NTT faculty list and have that secured. We made a special election call and the deadline will be very soon, so we hope to have that satisfied. This seat for NTT will be until spring 2026. We also have a *proxy* for Laurel Fredrickson for fall 2025 and that is *Sarah Lewison*. And I'd like to thank Sarah for that and also Dean Hong Chang of CAM for suggesting the proxy.

C. Undergraduate Education Policy Committee: Chair Jonathan Remo

J. Remo stated the committee met this morning. As of this morning, we are moving forward with the 8 or 9 RMEs that are on our plate. We are going to meet again a second time in September to clear our backlog. Then we're going to get onto the "Quiet Week" proposal. RMEs & proposal the committee is working on:

1. *Create BFA Media Arts, Eliminate Cinema BA*
2. *Digital Marketing Specialization*
3. *Minor in 3D Computer Animation*
4. *Minor in Animation & Game Design*
5. *Rename Minor in Cinema*
6. *Rename BA RTD and Specializations*
7. *"Quiet Week" Proposal*
8. *Rename BS & Minor Crop, Soil, & Environmental Management*
9. *TESOL UG Certificate*
10. *Minor in Applied Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management*

We are also able to move forward the approval of the program reviewers for Horticulture, Language, Cultures, & International Studies, Fermentation Science, Geology and Geography by majority vote using a Microsoft Poll.

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

J. Remo stated Committee on Committees placed a call for faculty volunteers for sixteen open committee positions across the university. We successfully filled all these positions utilizing the faculty volunteers. When there was more than one volunteer for a given position, the committee selected the highest-ranking faculty member for the position. If there was a tie between faculty ranks for the given position, the person volunteering first was selected to fill the position. The COC voted appointment of the committee members to the respective committee in two blocks. The COC members and attendance for Block 1 were Drs. Apgar, Bu, Shamsi, Page, and Remo. Block 2 included votes from Drs. Apgar, Bu, Shamsi, and Remo. Dr. Page had to leave the meeting to teach class. All unanimously voted in favor of the following members for the committees listed below. COC also voted to recommend Professor *Jennifer Sherry* to continue serving on the Technology Advisory Committee, and we approved

Professor *Liliana Lefticariu* to Chair the Judicial Review Board. These votes were taken by Microsoft Poll, and the votes were six out of six approving these volunteers and votes cast by Drs. Apgar, Bu, Paige, Lewison, Shamsi, and Remo.

List of recommended committee members that have been chosen to serve:

- 1. Budget Committee Chair – approve David M. Johnson to serve as Chair** (also see Section VIII, A, 3)
- 2. Two at-large faculty seats need to be filled (1-yr term) for FSWC & UEPC**
 - a. Student rep. for UEPC (UGSG VP of Student Affairs):** *Abby Tate*
 - b. UEPC:** *Erin Perry & Katherine Martin*
 - c. FSWC:** *Vjollca Konjufca & Heeyoung Han*
- 3. Elections Committee – (3) faculty at-large volunteers (1-yr term):** *Moria Fiscus, Justin Sextro, & Irene Miller*
- 4. Honorary Degree & Distinguished Service Award Committee – fill 2 seats:**
*Ranjiv Matthews (*3-yr term, finish Dr. Lee's term) & Cassie Wagner (4-yr term)*
- 5. Technology Advisory Committee – approve Jennifer Sherry to continue serving on committee & need another volunteer (2-yr term):** *Ruopu Li*
- 6. Recreational Sports & Services Advisory Board – approve Cheryl (Shelly) Page to serve on advisory board (2-yr term)**
- 7. Academic Calendar & Final Exam Committee – fill one seat (2-yr term):** *Kwangho Choi*
- 8. Public Safety Advisory Board – fill one seat (2-yr term):** *Marissa Ellermann*
- 9. Traffic & Parking Committee - fill one seat (3-yr term):** *Matthew Gorzalski*
- 10. Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee - fill one seat (3-yr term):** *Taeho Yoh*

Note: *Chancellor's Taskforce on Diversity & Inclusion – No longer exists.*

Note: Dean Walters was in agreement to *remove Library Affairs Advisory Committee* from the Senate website since they have not met in years. He stated we do have good communication with the faculty through our subject/liaison librarians and through the College/School Deans/Directors, so I don't think the Library Affairs Advisory Committee is needed at this time.

Motion: J. Farrish

Second: G. Apgar

A vote commenced: 26 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. All the nominees listed above were accepted and approved as presented to serve on the various committees.

K. Meksem stated please, if you are serving on a committee from the Faculty Senate, we would like to see a report from you every month sent to the Faculty Senate email address about your work on that committee. The first Tuesday of month send us a report about your activity there – what you have done, what you have decided, what you are working on – to keep Senators informed of all activities.

E. Budget Committee: (David M. Johnson – to be confirmed Chair)

K. Meksem stated D. M. Johnson is now officially our Chair. D. M. Johnson stated I suggested to the committee (we've already discussed a little electronically) is to try to provide some additional context regarding the Provost's observations about our student-faculty ratio and the program make up to see whether SIU is indeed spending more money on faculty than our peers are. We will arrange a meeting pretty soon and expect to be back with a more detailed report at the next meeting.

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

1. Faculty Emeritus Status discussion

G. Apgar shared his screen titled, "Emeritus/Emerita Status Policy and Procedure"- draft. G. Apgar stated the approach here was a joint committee with us and people from the Graduate Council to define what's expected to be named as or recognized as an Emeritus or Emerita of SIU. So, it's pretty specific. During our committee meeting, we had librarian representation who had concerns over some of the electronic databases that we employ, because they are to only to be with people affiliated with SIU and no others. What you'll notice here is the addition of some red words instead of the original read "*library facilities, and services, e-mail access, . . .*" etc., and we added "*resources*" as one of those caveats to cover that access. And then on the very last line, there was a period here and the committee decided to add "*with the understanding that library privileges may be limited by contractual terms*" as an effort to get away from the contractual limitations by having people of official affiliation with SIU - having access to those benefits. I brought it to the Executive Committee and a colleague of mine brought up some excellent discussion about why should we limit this? There are some instances whereby this could limit our ability to actually have some invited people come in and serve with us on a research or teaching effort. And so, I bring this to the Senate as a whole, because I'm kind of unsure where to go. From my understanding it appears as if that last sentence gives the ultimate out so that you can still underwrite that access without having impacted the concern of the library. The contrary perspective is we shouldn't be limiting this, and it really is why are we worried about something that hasn't happened yet instead of pre-empting some that may be a problem. So, with that, I'd like to put forth this discussion point if anybody feels one way or the other; it would be really good for us to move this along. I believe this copy was forwarded to Kelly Bender over at the Graduate Council in an effort to get this pushed forward.

S. Lewison stated I don't understand why the split with Emeritus and Emerita – it seems like a kind of unnecessary effort that I don't know what kind of meaning it has today. **G. Apgar** stated that's the way I received it, because this came from the Graduate Council and a joint Task Force with representation from both. And this is the way it was. It was put into verbiage. So, I can't answer that question, Sarah, I'm not sure if there was meaning, or if it was just meant to be completely inclusive; I don't know.

E. Hascup stated I'm wondering if this only applies to Carbondale, and if it does, why doesn't it apply to School of Medicine and anywhere else? **K. Meksem** stated the document actually was received from our Provost and there were discussions about it last year, and it was forwarded to a special committee actually within SIU. The committee discussed the document and came up with recommendations for this draft. So, the draft is now back to the Grad. School and Faculty Senate to modify and approve. Yes, normally it's supposed to apply to every institution within SIU. **E. Hascup** stated based on the verbiage, it's not clear because it specifically says Carbondale on there in multiple places instead of just SIU system. **APAA Wallace** stated this is an excellent point being brought up. I worked with the committee who developed this, and I think we can certainly have the discussion about whether or not this includes School of Medicine, but we need to check with School of Medicine to see if they already have an Emeritus Policy within the School of Medicine. Sometimes their policies are a little bit hard to find. I did Google it and it comes up with something, but I think that's an excellent point that we need to follow up on. (**Provost Tucker** stated in the chat, "Yes, School of Medicine is under SIUC. Springfield campus is under SIUC.") **G. Apgar** stated I guess we better not vote on this then. We better pull it and revisit. **K. Meksem** stated so, we will revisit the policy waiting for those points to be clarified before the vote and hopefully so in our meeting in October.

N. Anaza stated I do think those last few words in red are really limiting, especially for scholars that still continue on in their research after they retire. And do keep in mind, even though they're retired, it still has the SIUC name on those publications or grants or whatever it is. So, I do think it just does a lot of limitations. Those faculty members that while they may not be in the classroom are actively still researching. So, I would highly recommend that those few words be removed if peaceable. **G. Apgar** stated I can go back to the faculty in the library, because they were concerned about contractual responsibilities and the inability for us to, I mean because obviously EBSCO and some of those negotiated contracts are hinging upon the fact that we have some association of those people using their product, and I don't know how difficult that negotiation is. So, it was requested that we have that pretty much because in that last paragraph it says that a department or a unit can allow people to have all of these options, and we wanted to limit some of the exposure to that potential contractual issue. **APAA Wallace** stated, if a contract prohibits it, the library has to honor that. So, whether the words are there or not, we will have to follow whatever the contracts say.

K. Bender stated I was going to do this in my Grad Council report. I'm the Chair of Grad Council. The only real concerns on our end - this went to our new Educational Policies Committee, and they just wanted to have clarification in the administrator paragraph that those faculty that are administrators will have had 10 years of some sort of service to be eligible. I think it states that in the first paragraph somewhere where it says faculty/administrators, but it kind of gets lost then in the second paragraph. And the only other thing that some of the members thought there would be a way to streamline the process so it's not as I guess in-depth as Tenure and Promotion. But I know this has already gone through various committees, so I don't think that would hang up anything, because I don't really want to have to restart that process. If the Faculty Senate is agreeable to having this move from program to college and then to the Provost's Office, I think I can work with our council to get that approved. **K. Meksem** stated Kelly and Gary, if you can, please get together. This way we can coordinate those points, and then bring us back a document that we can vote on.

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

R. Auxier stated I was waiting until I got back into the country, which was Sunday, to schedule a meeting. I expect to schedule one this week. There are a couple of things that have happened that belong in this report. One is that from the executive committee meeting, the discussion of "Quiet Week" raises Governance issues, and I think Chris Wienke from our committee brought this up as well. It is not clear to me that this is at the discretion of the Provost. I believe there are a fair number of us who believe that this is an academic issue and not just a scheduling issue. And so, I think that has to be discussed. I wrote up some of the concerns that we had regarding, not the part that you guys are going to do, but how this thing is being presented to us because it seems like administrative executive reach. If not, overreach to us. And so, we're going to discuss that. I sent a note to the Provost, essentially seeking clarifications. I copied Khalid on it and also, he forwarded some other stuff from Governance Committee folks to the Provost. I was not satisfied with the answers that we got today. Not even a little bit. And so, I have a feeling the Governance Committee will take this up - if you guys (COC) will hold off until we get some clarity regarding how this was done. The confusing and rather heavy-handed - we're being asked for an endorsement. Part of what I sent to the Provost and copied Khalid on was, is that all we get here? You don't want us to study this at all? I think it's premature and therefore, if we can send a communication from the Governance Committee to the full Faculty Senate that says we think this isn't being handled in a shared governance fashion. Then the other thing is that in the executive committee, Chancellor Lane asked for a resolution that we've been working on for quite a while, but what happened was

the Governance Committee last year finished this resolution, but before the Faculty Senate could meet, the Governance Committee changed because we shifted over, so it never got before the whole Faculty Senate, but the resolution is done. And so, Chancellor Lane asked for it and the executive committee didn't see any reason I shouldn't give it to him. So, I did with the caveat that this is not a resolution of the Faculty Senate at this point, this is this is a list of the things that aren't happening in the financial end of SIU. And it's quite a list. Now I expect to just bring this to the next Faculty Senate meeting to be approved as a resolution, but the Chancellor already has it. I don't think it needs any more work. Chris could perhaps confirm that; we worked on it for a year. There are a couple of other things before the Governance Committee that they don't need to be reported without a meeting.

H. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE: Lichang Wang

L. Wang stated there has been no activity from the Faculty Advisory Council since the last July meeting. It will be next Friday. I will attend the meeting and hopefully report to you. One thing I would like to say is my written report from last July, I had an attachment which I forgot to attach and then I attached it this time. It's an annual report of FAC to IBHE - talking about what we have done and then the accomplishments we made.

I. Graduate Council Representative: Kelly Bender

(Re: Faculty Emeritus Status discussion – please see Section VIII, F, 1 – last paragraph)

K. Bender stated we had our first meeting on Thursday of the General Council, and I already mentioned the Faculty Emeritus Policy, which I think we're really close to agreeing on. The other thing we did discuss is the Dead Week proposal, which I guess missed and didn't realize it doesn't pertain to graduate students, but I will say the consensus of a faculty who made comments is that we were not in support of a Dead Week, especially when you're talking about the fall semester. So, students would have the entire week off for Thanksgiving and then another week off before finals week. I'm not sure in this policy the research that's been done at other institutions if they get that full week off for Thanksgiving as well. So, I foresee us voting on a resolution of no support in October. But you know, I'm not sure if it'll pass. Possibly faculty that were supportive just didn't make comments. The only other two things to report are that we approved an RME for moving the Master's degree in Counseling and Rehabilitation Education from the School of Health Sciences to the School of Physical and Behavioral Sciences, and our program review committee already has reviewers in place for a review of the MA and MS in Geology, the MS in Geography and Environmental Resources, the PhD in Geosciences, as well as the PhD in Electrical and Computer Engineering.

IX. Old Business

- Reaching faculty via Teams – not working/looking for solutions

R. Auxier stated I spoke with Craig Engstrom about this. He was charged with implementing the shift from Zoom to Teams. I have talked to him - it can't be less than 10x - about all the problems that are associated with this. Also, it affects phone service on campus.

J. Sherry asked if anybody else was having trouble when students take online exams that log into Respondus Monitor? When you give exams and you have them locked into the exam, if students are using certain electronic devices such as any type of Mac or Chromebooks, they're doing something very strange. So, then they can't log into the exam or the quiz, and then you start getting panic happening. **L. Byfield** stated I've had that issue with the LockDown Browser and the students would send the screenshot of what the issue was and then Saluki Tech or whoever couldn't figure out. So even one semester, I think it was fall of 2024, of 27 students about 10 of them couldn't do the final exam online; it was just painful - the whole process. So, I had to figure out how to reconfigure their grades. And throughout the spring of this year too

I've had issues with students doing their quizzes using the Lockdown Browser. **J. Sherry** stated and then also, they've gone around and changed a lot of the Wi-Fi boxes in some of the buildings, and they aren't working very well either. K. Meksem stated it seems to me that there are two people we have to call for the next meeting (Craig and IT). K. Meksem asked Faculty Status & Governance Committee if they would like to take care of this - get in touch with Craig and IT. G. Apgar stated absolutely.

C. Wienke stated maybe add another item regarding Zoom licenses. Following pandemic, we were told that we would have access to full subscriptions to Zoom and that stopped this semester. I was wondering why that was unilaterally decided or arbitrarily decided on whether we can have continued access to full subscription to Zoom. **R. Auxier** stated I was paying for my own Zoom, because Teams doesn't work. I was told at the same time that you probably were, that I'm no longer even allowed to buy my access to Zoom. It's a university policy, and so I was told you could always have a personal subscription to Zoom. I was told the university has no relationship with Zoom.

X. New Business

C. Padovani stated I have written this statement together with my colleague Professor Lisa Malloy. I rise here to urge the Senate to consider a resolution condemning the ongoing genocide of Palestinians in Gaza. We acknowledge the horror of the October 7, 2023, attack in Israel, but what has followed is the systematic destruction of people and their system. As of September 3, 2025, UN OCHA reports 63,746 Palestinians killed and more than double that number were injured in Gaza. Mass displacement and famine now define daily life. The UN estimates around 90% of Gaza's 2.1 million people have been displaced. Independent food security analysts, backed by the World Health Organization, now confirm famine in Gaza projected to reach Phase 5 of catastrophe by the end of this month. Education has also been deliberately devastated—what UN experts call “scholasticide.” The Education Cluster's latest satellite-verified snapshot finds 97% of Gaza's schools have sustained damage, and all higher-education institutions have been damaged or destroyed. Freedom of information has been crushed. The Committee to Protect Journalists confirms 197 journalists killed—the deadliest conflict for the press in modern records. International law is unambiguous about our duty. The International Court of Justice has issued binding orders to prevent genocidal acts, and the UN General Assembly has repeatedly demanded an immediate, unconditional ceasefire. As educators, our mission is knowledge and human dignity. Silence is complicity. I ask the Senate to (1) condemn the genocide and scholasticide; (2) call for an immediate ceasefire, unfettered humanitarian access, and protection for journalists, educators, students; and (3) affirm solidarity with Gaza's students, scholars, and institutions.

K. Meksem stated you have heard the concerns. Would anyone like to move this motion on the floor? *S. Lewison motioned and S. Page seconded.* D. M. Johnson stated I think passing a motion in the last three minutes of a Senate meeting on this serious of a matter without any warning for faculty in advance is not a good idea. R. Auxier stated I agree with Dave. I want to read the resolution. It sounded like something I could support, but I also feel like I need to talk with colleagues that I represent. K. Meksem stated we are going to have the document sent to our Faculty Senators. This way we can review it and go back to our units. C. Page stated maybe we could table the issue.

Motion: C. Wienke

Second: S. Page

A vote commenced: 24 Yeas, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The “document” regarding Gaza was approved to be tabled until the October meeting.

K. Meksem stated when we invite guests to our meetings, we want them to send us a document or at least bullet points of what they're going to talk about. This way you receive it at least a week before. Everyone will have time dedicated to what they're going to talk about. Also, if you have a concern or request, you're welcome to communicate that ahead of the meeting or during the meeting.

XI. Adjournment

Motion: D. M. Johnson

Second: S. Lewison