

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**July 15, 2025**  
**Via MS Teams & Morris Library Room 754**  
**1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.**

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

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

**II. Roll Call: John Farrish**

Present: Nwamaka Anaza, Gary Apgar, Randall Auxier, Erica Blumenstock, Lingguo Bu, Lavern Byfield, Christopher Chiasson, Kwangho Choiy, John Farrish, Ghassan Ishak, David M. Johnson, Jia Liu, Khalid Meksem, Katie Moore, Cinzia Padovani, Kaitlyn Poirier, Jonathan Remo, Nicole Roberts, Jennifer Sherry, Cassie Wagner, Jennifer Walker, Christopher Wienke, Geoffrey Young

Absent: Daniel Bronke, Laurel Fredrickson, Erin Hascup, Frances T. Lee, Seung-Hee Lee, Yueh-Ting Lee, Shelly Page, Jun Qin, Mohtashim Shamsi, Ahmed Torky, Haibo Wang, Benna Williams

Guests: Iraklis Anagnostopoulos, Kelly Bender, James Carter, Julie Dunston, Shelly Gehrke, Melissa Laake, Austin Lane, Kimberli Morgan, David Shirley, Erin Stumpf, Constantinos Tsatsoulis, Sheryl Tucker

**III. Approval of Minutes from May 13, 2025**

Motion: J. Remo

Second: C. Wienke

A vote commenced: 19 Yeas, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The minutes from May 13, 2025, were approved as presented.

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

K. Meksem stated our next meeting is in September. There are plenty of things going on at SIU and actually our Provost and Chancellor are going to be talking about it soon, and I really would like you guys to be more attentive. This way we can discuss this and see how the Faculty Senate can move in support of certain things that need to happen within SIU.

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

J. Sherry stated on June 20th, 2025, Faculty Senate President Meksem and I attended a Teams meeting with Chancellor Lane, Provost Tucker and Dir. David Shirley to discuss some upcoming items for SIUC. Items of discussion included the retention model, the Governor's 2% hold of funds coming to SIUC, student-to-faculty ratios and Course Dog program coming in fall 2027. Two items have been brought to my attention for the Faculty Senate and/or pertinent committees to discuss. The first item was Emeritus Faculty. There was a concern that was brought up by a retiree about the Emeritus Faculty and codifying qualifications or criteria for the designation. And the concerns by the former faculty who were insured their status of Emeritus Faculty. This would include continued use of Morris Library. For example, approximately 80% of retired aviation technology faculty who should be eligible are not reflected on the program's website, therefore, Morris Library staff cannot allow them to use their resources. I believe the Emeritus Faculty Committee that was created in spring 2025 has been working on this criterion. And I would ask for this to be considered before moving forward with more concrete criteria. I know there has been a draft of the policy that has kind of been created by the committee. I look forward to hearing how that is moving along. The second item was a request to reinstate the "send proof" link as an option for course evaluations. Faculty should have the choice whether to incentivize their completion. Having students include a screenshot to the faculty creates an additional burden for them, and this link is already built into the software system. When I talked to Provost Tucker last week, she had referred me to Craig Engstrom, and I've already kind of heard from Craig; I'm going to meet with him regarding this. The rationale/decision of moving forward with the "send proof" link would be very beneficial to make it seamless and easy, not only for the students, but for the faculty to receive very valuable and valid feedback from the students.

## VI. Reports

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

K. Meksem stated he plans to meet with the Chairs/Co-Chairs of the Committees in August when faculty are back on contract.

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

### C. Undergraduate Education Policy Committee: Co-Chairs, Yueh-Ting Lee & Jonathan Remo *(no report)*

K. Meksem stated Yueh-Ting Lee is resigning/leaving SIU. We will need to find another Senator to replace him.

### D. Budget Committee: Chair, Geoffrey Young – *(no report)*

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

J. Remo stated Cheryl and I will be sending an email towards the beginning of the semester for a call of volunteers (2 faculty at large) for Faculty Status & Welfare Committee and Undergraduate Education Policy Committee.

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

### G. Governance Committee: Co-Chairs, Jun Qin & Randall Auxier – *(no report)*

### H. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE: Lichang Wang (Report shown below was sent with the meeting invite.)

Two FAC to IBHE meetings were held following my previous report at the FS meeting on April 29, 2025. The first took place on May 16, 2025, at the Illinois Association of School Boards in Springfield, and the second on June 25, 2025, at the University of Illinois, Springfield in the morning, followed by a session at the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum in the afternoon. During the May meeting, there was a guest presentation by the IBHE chair, Mr. Pranav Koltari, on several topics currently under consideration by the Board. Mr. Koltari discussed efforts to diversify higher education faculty, noting that all funds allocated for this initiative have been utilized. The General Assembly will soon have an opportunity to evaluate these expenditures. He also addressed the development of a long-term funding formula, for which IBHE staff can provide technical support. Finally, Mr. Koltari indicated that the Board supports the Governor's plan to allow community colleges to award baccalaureate degrees in specific fields and will offer guidance to help achieve the intended outcomes of this initiative. The FAC IBHE members were preparing reports to the IBHE board meeting in June. The June meeting serves as the end-of-the-year meeting. During the morning session, FAC IBHE members discussed tasks for the upcoming year across the three caucuses (4-year public universities; independent institutions; and 2-year Institutions) and the six working groups (Equity; Early College; Mental Health; Higher Education Funding; Prior Learning Assessment; Tech and Higher Education). There was also a presentation by Jennifer B. Barnett, Associate Director of Workforce Analytics at IBHE, providing an update on Workforce Initiatives. In the afternoon, representatives joined the IBHE for business presentations and delivered the annual report of the FAC IBHE. Further details on the FAC IBHE meeting can be found in the meeting minutes at <http://www.facibhe.org/meetings/minutes.php>. The next FAC to IBHE meeting will be held on September 19, 2025.

### I. Graduate Council Representative: Kelly Bender

K. Bender stated the first Executive Council meeting will be August 21, 2025 and the first General Council meeting will be September 4, 2025. We have set all of our committees, and we're working on getting the website updated for anyone who needs more information.

## VII. Old Business - *(none)*

## VIII. New Business

### - Two open seats in Senate

K. Meksem stated there will be two Senate seats to fill (Yueh-Ting Lee - CHHS & Marissa Ellerman – NTT, Library Affairs). Yueh-Ting Lee will be leaving SIU and Marissa Ellerman, who was Non-Tenured Track is now Tenured Track. J. Sherry suggested getting representation from the *Human Sciences* since the other three Senators are from the Health Sciences in the College of Health & Human Science. J. Sherry offered to take the lead on this task with Committee on Committees. C. Wagner stated there is no one left in Library Affairs that is NTT. K. Meksem suggested scheduling a meeting to discuss filling the NTT seat.

- **Digital Textbook Program Concern**

D. Johnson stated he received some concerns about the digital textbook program from a colleague. I applaud moves to make textbooks affordable for students, but there's evidence, at least as I understand it, that actually hard copies are better than digital copies. The cost savings are not very significant for humanities programs and the opt out provision is difficult. I don't know if that's been discussed in the Senate before I joined, if it's been discussed in committee or just where it lies, but it seems like this is something that faculty ought to have a say on. **Provost Tucker** stated this was brought before Faculty Senate numerous times. We've had formal presentations, etc. We have a resolution from USG. Faculty have had many options to participate in this discussion. The opt out process is like 2 clicks for a student. Digital is preferred because of the cost savings for the students and it integrates into D2L. Provost Tucker stated that things that are discussed at Faculty Senate are not filtering down to the faculty. There seems to be a disconnect in the representation of Senate and getting information to the faculty in schools and colleges. **APAA Dunston** stated there was a Follett representative that presented in March 2024, and there was a pilot last summer with accounting. The feedback from the students was very positive. They talked about it in the USG meeting and the GSPC meetings that took place in fall 2024. We worked with AVC Tena Bennett to make sure we got in front of all the right constituency groups and that everyone had an opportunity to ask questions about that. I know it was brought up in Faculty Senate after there was discussion in Faculty Senate about the Follett Program and how that was progressing. I know the Chancellor, in the spring meeting maybe in February or March, mentioned the Follett Program. So, I do think it is the responsibility of this body as well as Graduate Council to take back this information when we're looking at new initiatives to make sure that they take that to their peers and give an opportunity for them to weigh in and then bring that back to the full body. We have been communicating. I've been reaching out to school Directors and working with Follett to identify language that can go in the syllabi. To answer questions, we added an FAQ page for faculty on our official Follett website, and there's also student FAQ's. So, we've been really trying to make sure we get the information out there and maybe kind of dispel some of the myths. There's communication that's going to be going out to parents and students through Slate. Doug Troue is working on that. So, this is something I feel we have put that information out there, we piloted it and we've done everything we can to get the information to all the right groups of people. **D. Johnson** stated Faculty Senate is very poorly designed to communicate to faculty. It's not designed for that. There are a handful of representatives from COLA, but we don't represent schools or we don't have specific constituencies. It seems like you guys have informed the Faculty Senate well and the Faculty Senate should be able to give you feedback if they didn't like the plan. But just announcing something - I don't report to anybody. I don't have any constituents other than the same constituents that four or five other people have or however many there are in COLA. So, I think we all need to rethink how the Faculty Senate works. It's lousy as a way of communicating to faculty. **Provost Tucker** stated I don't disagree, but it's in the operating paper. I would love for Faculty Senate to look at the operating paper and see if there are opportunities to improve this. I know there's been a Faculty Senate newsletter, but I don't know if that captures everything either. **Chancellor Lane** stated we expect our Deans to be able to communicate these pieces that we're trying to put in place, because we have met with Faculty Senate. As you heard Julie Dunston mention, we have had these discussions. So, I'm expecting not just the Provost, but also our Deans to be communicating to their faculty about what is coming and to give us that feedback if we've missed something, because we have a track record of really working with faculty on big items like this. So, I'm really pleased that you brought this point up. I think there is some work that can be done. It's going to take all of us to make sure we communicate. **K. Meksem** suggested sending the information directly to the Deans and letting the Deans communicate through their school Directors the information directly to the faculty. He also stated maybe the Deans can start holding meetings for their colleges, at least one in fall and one in spring, where a Senator could present information that would be very important to their fellow faculty.

- **Post on Facebook from Bursar's Office – Insurance Credit**

J. Sherry stated I saw a post on Facebook a day ago from the Bursar's Office about the insurance credit. Enrolled students in fall 2025 - if they have comparable health insurance, there was a message that went out that said you may be eligible for an insurance credit of \$1,139. The deadline is the end of August and some freshman families have been going to try to do this process, and they've been denied. I'm not sure

if it's a glitch in the system or if it is something on the insurance end, on the health service end or the bursar end. I've heard from two or three families already stating that they had been denied the credit, and when they called SIU, and I'm not sure what department they called, they said they didn't get any information. **Chancellor Lane** read a statement from Donald Howard, Deputy Director of SIUC Student Health Services Office. It said that there was an error in the waiver system, but it has been corrected. Chancellor Lane stated it has taken about 24 hours after receiving a few notes from some parents and others, so thank you for bringing that up. I think we have it resolved now.

**IX. Invited Guests:**

**A. Chancellor Lane – updates on budget**

Chancellor Lane thanked everyone for joining the meeting. He stated I hope your summer is going well, you're spending time with your families and getting a chance to take a little bit of a break because it's going to be fast and furious this fall. We are really excited about the summer enrollment increase thanks to the faculty, Provost Tucker, and others. Our new student orientations have been packed. We're thinking of adding a few more new student orientations to capture some of those students that come in at the last minute. Our graduate student enrollment is looking good, but our international student enrollment – there's some concerns about that. There are a couple of reasons that we can point to that we think is causing that, but that's something that we're watching very closely. Over the next couple of weeks, we'll be focused on our new students trying to make sure those that were signed up for new student orientation are actually going to be registered for their classes. So, a big shout out to Dr. Gehrke and her team. The advisors are working like crazy to make sure those students have appointments and that they get registered. So, there's a lot of effort that's happening to make sure our fall enrollment is up. As you remember, last year we were at 11,790 students. That was a 3.8% increase and was the highest we've been in years. Every year we've been up. So, our enrollment, unlike other universities, it's actually been going north, which is a good thing. But to do that again, we're going to really have to work down the stretch together and make sure that students are able to register. We found out at the end of the legislative session, the Governor announced that he would be holding back for us \$2.6 million of the funding that we were counting on. That applies to all universities, not necessarily \$2.6 million, but whatever they were thinking they were going to get during the legislative session. They are not getting at least 2% of that. So, it's not just Southern Illinois University. It's every university in the state. Our amount that we thought we were getting again was \$2.6 million. We're getting \$877,000 and that \$1.7 million will be held. We don't know why. We don't have any communication that's come our way about why the hold of those funds. I've tried not to speculate, so I won't speculate on the call with all of you here, and we don't know when those funds are going to be released. And so, we're kind of in a holding pattern. And as you know, we count and rely very heavily on the state appropriation in addition to our tuition revenue, which I just mentioned with enrollment that dictates that. So, there are a couple of things that we are going to be adjusting until those funds become available or things that we're going to be putting in place. One of those items is going to be a *hiring freeze*. We're moving the hiring chill to a hiring freeze. The freeze will only impact state appropriated or funds where folks are on state dollars. The grants or anything else that's tied to these local funds will not impact any of the hiring. The Provost and I have talked. If there's any NTT things that we need to hire in that regard, we will do that. We will continue to do that. So, it won't have an impact on hiring any NTTs that we may need down the stretch. I know that we have the majority of our faculty in place now that are going to be teaching for the fall semester. This is probably going to impact more of the staffing operations. I've talked to our A&P and Civil constituency leads. They're aware of it and understand it. I've talked to all of the leads that I typically meet with every month and explained what I'm explaining to you. So out of the gate, we have to slow that spending down until we can find out when the Governor is going to release those dollars. We are still looking at - and this is for non-represented staff - our CBIZ study and adjusting some of those staff members who are in those categories that are not being paid up to minimum or if there's some compression pieces there that we have to make some adjustments with, we're still looking at adjusting them per the CBIZ study in addition to looking at a 1% across the board again for non-represented folks. So, despite the freeze and some of the things that we're putting in place to make sure we're going to be in a good position, we're still moving forward and taking care of

our folks inside. We just have to be careful hiring/putting people on a payroll. Our focus is on the folks that are here now and not the folks that necessarily are not here that we'd have to get here. I think there's a cause for celebration when you look at some of the retention numbers. So, hats off to our faculty and to others. Our strategies for how we move forward are always going to be enrollment, retention, and some other strategies with freezing hiring, not layoffs. Another piece that I wanted to touch on is this work we've been on for probably the last couple of years with low producing programs. That's also been added to our strategy as I just mentioned enrollment, retention, some of the freeze and then doing an analysis on the low producing programs that we have here to see. Are there some efficiencies that we can capture? Are there some things that we can do to enhance some of the low producing programs? We've done that before as well - some programs that we have here now. Is there a way to market or advertise? Is there a way to condense some things? I think maybe last year was the first time that our legislators actually inquired about those programs that we turned into the IBHE that were low producing, asking us what we were going to do about it. It's probably the first time in my five years that it was even brought up. So, I think about almost a year ago, we started looking at those reports that we actually submitted to IBHE and started asking some of the questions about what's on the list and does anyone know that they're there? And do we have any plans to really again enhance or try and condense or anything that we could do to really get to the bottom of that? So, you'll hear a little bit more of that from the Provost as she comes up today. Before I bring David on, I want to end with something you probably read about that the board has approved - that's the demolition of old Greek Row. That is for us a complete eyesore. And believe it or not we maintain that, because you can't fully shut them down. So, you talk about throwing money away. We're very fortunate to have our Foundation be willing to - and they'll get paid back if the bonds and everything goes through with this project - put some of their dollars in this to tear those buildings down so that we can actually build some new residential housing that we so desperately need. Many of our students are living off campus and in some conditions that you probably wouldn't put your son or daughter or niece or nephew in. We would like to bring them on campus. We think it's going to help with students being involved in our living and learning communities on campus. We think it's just going to be a game changer for our university to be able to do that. This money will not come from the state. Many of you have probably been at universities where there have been some P3 partnerships that are there. We jumped into this P3 discussion months ago. And we really believe the only way universities in our state are going to be able to do anything like this is going to be through P3 partnerships, like we're forming now and our foundation is forming. That's about a 900-bed facility that we would create on the footprint of Greek Row; we would have special interest housing. We can't call it Greek housing, but we're calling it special interest housing. And the idea is again to bring more of our students on campus. If you look at AGR and some of the other houses, Tri-Delts, just some other houses out there that are pretty decrepit - their housing foundations are really asking to be on campus for a number of reasons. So, we're excited about it. We're taking a tower offline, but we're still using the tower. We will use it for other things, summer camps and things that we do to house folks that are coming on campus. So, it's not a tear down of any of the towers at all. It's just reallocating or shuffling students from one side of campus to another side of campus. We're also entertaining a year one and year two live on. We used to have it. For those of you that have been here for a while probably remember you had to live here your first year and then your second year. Most universities across the country still have that intact. For some reason we moved away from it, but we will be reinstituting that. We've talked with our USG President and others. And again, there's a programming piece that's tied to that. It's not just, hey, we want you here a year or two. We think we're going to also see some gains in retention. If we can keep students engaged, at least that first and second year, we think we're going to have some success at doing that.

**J. Sherry** stated there are some older buildings that look very similar to what's on Greek Row that's on Wall Street toward the South part of Wall. Any discussion about demolishing those? **Chancellor Lane** stated yeah, so part of that campus master plan, those buildings along with Southern Hills and others are probably going to get more traction inside the campus master plan. This one kind of moved up pretty fast, and we had a target area specifically for old Greek Row. We've been talking

about it for a number of years, but nothing's off the table and that's an area that needs some attention. But we really think it's going to make the campus look more appealing. There's also a phase two design for law school housing and medical school housing in that same area. There is talk about doing some pretty neat things right across from the law school with housing. I think when we said that to Trustee Simmons for the Simmons Law School, he was really excited to hear about that. Parents, believe it or not, will come down sometimes and if they can't get in Thompson Point or some other areas, we lose students. And so, you've got to have some modernized housing to attract students if you're looking for traditional students. We think even our graduate students will be able to come off of where they live now onto campus and some of that space like in the towers that opened up. So, we think it's even going to bring in graduate students that may want to live with us as well. I wanted to highlight Dir. David Shirley. David is kind of the man behind the numbers. And he does an incredible job. He's the only one I listen to because he has verified the data that we're putting out.

**D. Shirley** shared his screen titled, "Fall to Fall Retention Progress." Retention – a tale of two indicators. Indicator 1 - Did we retain a higher/lower *percentage* than your prior year? Indicator 2 - Did we retain higher/lower *headcount* of students than last year? If we just look at Indicator 1, we're flat at this point and for five weeks out, we're looking at the first-time, full-time student. We took this data as of Monday, and we've registered 63% of the 1,623 fall 2024 cohort who are returning for fall 2025. Last year at this time, we also had registered 63% of 1,483 students. So, because of how percentages work, on that second indicator we're up, because that first cohort last year was smaller than our current cohort that we're dealing with. That's 63%, even though it's flat percentage wise, is an increase of about 79 students retained so far. And I'm sure Dr. Gehrke can confirm that every student has their own unique way getting re-registered and so on. So, there is a tremendous amount of work that that has gone into every single one of those extra 79. So yes, retention from year to year so far is flat percentage wise. We've enrolled more students than last year and then a couple more items that we look at. We look at 10 out of the 12 major demographic groups of interest that we track are being retained either at a higher percentage than last year or with a higher headcount. Six of the seven colleges are retaining students either at a higher percentage rate or with a larger head count, and four out of the seven colleges are retaining students within 4% of their targeted goals that they hope to achieve for this retention cycle - on their way to hopefully all of us seeing a retention goal of 80% being achieved fall to fall for 2030.

**Chancellor Lane** stated in the fall, Dir. David Shirley is hosting the Retention Retreat, VC Wendell Williams is hosting the Enrollment Retreat, and we're adding a Marketing Retreat that Ex. Dir. Jeff Harmon will lead.

**B. Provost Tucker – annual report; faculty professional development; low producing programs**

Provost Tucker stated an update from the Board meeting last week - the purchase of Course Dog has been approved. That is new software that will allow us to do academic scheduling, course demand projections, curriculum management, catalog management, syllabus management and curricular analytics, and then faculty workload is an additional piece that we are looking at right now. We are moving forward as a system level purchase with SIUE (this started out as a catalog discussion). That contract will hopefully be squared away this week. We're looking at the catalog piece - will be probably fall of 2027. So, it's not overnight that the implementation piece works, but you do need to recall that this will require significant activity from our faculty because our courses will be need to be reviewed, their descriptions, prerequisites – all of this as we move into a new catalog and curricular management system. We've started some of this work already with the four and five hundred level courses as part of HLC. We're delighted that we will eventually get away from paper Form 90s. On professional development, there are two reports there that you can look at. One report is from Cherie Watson, who was the Provost Faculty Fellow in this area, and we did launch a new professional development program, Saluki Teaching and Research Success or the STARS Program. This was to address a Faculty Senate resolution from 2023 that I report to you on what we're doing to support faculty professional development. I also included a second report from the Center of

Teaching Excellence so you can see the types of programs that are available and the attendance. We have plenty of bandwidth in these programs. We can support more faculty, and as we move to the use of D2L in fall 2026, we're hoping that faculty will take advantage of those offerings this year to make sure that you're prepared to use D2L, whether it be the grade book or a piece that for those of you who are pretty seasoned D2L users, you may not be using the assessment tool at this point in time. We do have a Cadillac version of that software that will allow us to do many things that can make the faculty's workload significantly lighter. We are piloting this summer the uploading of grades directly into Banner out of the grade book in D2L, and that's going smoothly. So, we will talk more about that as we go into the fall. But you do have the professional development report, and I'm happy to hear about pieces that you think are missing. We're really trying to fill the gaps, not replace some of the things that are going on at the school and college level. I do want to move to the presentation today to talk about the IBHE APEER's list or what we more commonly call low producing programs. (A PowerPoint presentation was shared on the screen.) Provost Tucker stated and again, some of this we've talked about, and I'm putting it in a broader context now. When I first got the IPEDS data from David Shirley, and this is David Shirley's data in general because that is the institutional data source, our peers didn't make any sense to me. So, a group of us started looking at all the IPEDS' metrics at the national level and coming up with a new set of peers. We are unique at SIU in the sense that not only are we R1, but we are 1 of 21 institutions in the country that is also an Opportunity Institution. So that talks to you about who we admit and graduate and their opportunity to have successful careers when they leave us. We also are located in a rural area, so when you start putting that mix together our peers are a little bit more challenging to get at. But these are the peers that we have identified, and you can see the student-to-faculty ratio of most research institutions is about 20 to 1 and our peers are sitting at 17. And here is where I was really alarmed when I saw this number - our student faculty ratio is 11-12 to 1. So, that means we have essentially what most private liberal arts colleges would see as a great student faculty ratio, but we are on a public school tuition model. We haven't raised our tuition, I think in eight years or more. So, that is really where I started looking at what is happening at the institution level. This is the data you can see from 2023 to 2024 that David looked at for me, and you can see we made a little bit of progress from 2023 to 2024 that we went from 11 to 12, but part of that is just those intentional discussions that now we're all thinking about it and talking about it. The next slide is starting to look at the number of degree programs we're offering compared to our peers. And so, if you look at our undergraduate headcount, we're relatively a smaller institution (and this is on an FTE basis) compared to our peers. SIU is offering significantly more undergraduate degree programs in comparison to our peers. And of course, we have fewer students than in those degree programs. At the master's level, very similar, we have almost 50% more degree programs at the master's level and again, these are our R1 peers, and we have fewer students in terms of headcount in those programs. At the doctoral program level, we have more degree programs, but here we actually have more students compared to our peers. So, at the doctoral level as an R1 institution, that's an important parameter that is less concerning. If we had just looked at this overall headcount per program compared to our peers, it really gets buried in the data. You would not have noticed that really we have a larger number of undergraduate and masters level programs with fewer students in them, particularly at the undergraduate level. So, these are some of the things that I started looking at when we talked about the IBHE APEER's list. If you recall this spring, we looked at low producing programs, and these are the three-year minimum averages that IBHE looks at. If you are following the news at what's happening in Indiana, they didn't have metrics like this, but their metrics are very similar. And if you go state to state, these numbers are not unusual for the majors enrolled and the degrees conferred. IBHE warns us every year about programs, and they have been so short staffed that the first round that we sent out we thought was the IBHE APEER's list. Well, they only selectively looked at certain programs. So, we used the metrics and applied those across SIU at the recommendation of the system. So, low producing programs, we provide the colleges a spreadsheet of those who were not meeting either enrollment or degree conferral criteria and then also the monitoring of one of the criterion showing up on the list just so we could be aware of what was going on. We asked people to respond to address what they might do within their resource allocation, because we don't anticipate new money and we're certainly looking at when we think of 2030, we want to be able to invest in not

only programs that there's opportunity for growth now, but also programs that will lead to the careers that our students will have in the future. It's an opportunity not only for 2030 but thinking about 2050. So artificial intelligence is a good example where Frank Liu, the Dean of Engineering, is working with Deans all across campus to think about an applied AI degree. Is there a space that we can really be a leader in this country and not compete against institutions that are looking at more at the coding side? So, we asked for actionable steps based on what IBHE asked for (sunsetting a program, consolidating a program or redesigning). And we were asked what you would do going into fall to look at your degree program if it's on this list. This is a summary of low producing programs by college and you can see that there are definitely a couple colleges where we have more concerns than we have in others based on the number of degree programs that showed up on the list. We had 28 undergraduate programs, 15 at the master's level and 3 at the doctoral level. We are looking at how do we maintain our Research 1 status. So, we've achieved it, but we also have to pay attention to how we maintain that. The doctoral summary list is here. We have three programs that show up. We have their responses that are shown here, whether they were redesigned or consolidated. One of them is a cooperative degree with our sister institution. And then we have programs for enrollment, they didn't show up on the list, but they are showing up on the list on degree conferral. Now occupational therapy - that's a brand new program that just recently went forward with their class. The master's program summary, I think I have two slides on this. You can see though the variety of responses 4+1 option, which is something that we really want to push that's not happening at the level we would like. So, Grad. Council approved this a while ago where outstanding seniors can start their graduate degree early and double count those hours. So, we'd like to see more growth in 4+1 options. That also means that we are attracting and recruiting more of our own students into our master's degree. So, that's going to be important also. You also will note Rise Point is one of our partners. Public administration is in Rise Point this year for the first time where they are doing marketing and recruiting as well for us and we've gone to an eight-week format. But you're also seeing a lot of "remove" from the list, though I've asterisked those, so I can talk about that in just a second. So, on the master's program summary, here's a group of programs that are not on the list for enrollment, but they are on degree conferral. Mathematics did a redesign post pandemic and actually see increasing enrollments. But going back to these "remove" from the list - so a lot of programs at the master's level said, well, that program doesn't cost us anything, because our master's coursework is the same as our doctoral coursework. The cost though is we have a low producing program. This is a public list and so what I want the faculty to start thinking about is we have a new coursework only option at the master's level that the Graduate Council approved. If you're not admitting directly into a master's program where you may have a strong thesis component, should we be considering the master's en route to the doctoral degree? Psychology programs across the country have been doing this for a long time. The students, when they finish their coursework, get their master's degree conferred. That counts as a degree conferral and it also in case that student stops out and doesn't finish the doctoral degree, we have the degree conferral. They've earned a credential along the way. So, I'm going to encourage us to think about some of that because we can't just go out and say to the public, well, these master's degree programs are only on the books in case somebody doesn't get a Ph.D. They're our fallback degree; they don't cost us anything. That is very difficult to articulate in a way that the average person would understand, and we need to rethink that mentality. This is the bachelor's program summary, and you can again see the responses are redesign, redesign, continue, a consolidation here and there, a couple of newer programs we have again potentially consolidate, redesign. So, in no program did we see anyone talking about this program is not reflective of who we are today and who we want to be. And then there are additional programs where you start seeing some that are not on the list from a degree conferral, because they have high enrollment that may or may not lead to them getting on the list in the future or being off the list. And we have a couple here we're already teaching out. So, we've let those programs go, and we're obligated to teach out those students - and so again, a fewer number of the bachelor's programs. So, when you look at kind of my high alert list, this is just what I was thinking about as I started looking at who's showing up on the list in multiple ways. And you can see we have some programs that show up at least on two criterion and one criterion of all three degree programs are showing up on those lists. That next group is we have at least two degree programs



showing up on the list of the three and then where do we have degree programs showing up at least in two criterion and one on the other ones and maybe none on the doctoral program list. So, this is kind of the high alert list that we have identified, but all our programs on that low producing list we're concerned about. We want to make room in our curriculum to offer new and novel things, but it does mean we can't continue to do everything we've been doing. And if you look at 2030, our plan for 15,000 students, our student faculty ratio would still be too low even when we hit our enrollment targets. So, what we talked about with Dr. Meksem and Dr. Sherry is what would the next steps be? And we agreed what we would like to do is to have follow-up meetings to occur with the program with a group of individuals. It would include Julie Dunston, our Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the Dean of the college or school where the program resides, having a representative from the faculty, whether it be from Faculty Senate or in case of a Graduate program, it would be a Graduate Council representative. And Chancellor Lane and I will be speaking with the leadership of Graduate Council, I think on August 5th. We have not been able to connect with them yet. I will say Dr. Meksem was very ambitious in the timeline. He thought really by the end of November we should be able to have recommendations based on those meetings and decisions about programs and the action plan for those programs by December. That is kind of what the plan was for us moving forward and how we think about our programs so that we can look at other opportunities to consolidate programs and to create more interdisciplinary programs to allow us to open up our resources to programs where we have wait lists, and there are workforce needs. You can think about nursing is one of those that most people are aware of; that's a nationwide shortage. But again, artificial intelligence, are there areas that we want to offer new programs in that you're excited about in your disciplinary expertise where things are shifting forward and we need other students to be prepared for those workforces.

**J. Sherry** stated a lot of our science based programs have faculty to student ratio constriction due to space, due to accreditation standards. Was all of this investigated as well whenever you looked at the numbers and does that skew the numbers in any way? **Provost Tucker** stated you will have accredited programs with restrictions as you said and space etc. So, like our College of Arts and Media does a lot of individualized instruction. In music, whether it be instrumental or voice, that is part of our portfolio, right? There are some things that we as an institution do because it is part of our mission and part of who we are and we will continue to do that. But our institution is no different than many other public R1s that have those same portfolio programs. So, it doesn't skew our data when we start thinking about peers. Does it skew our data going from college to college? Absolutely. But that's where the low producing program list sort of looks at that, because there is a disciplinary lens for that. But absolutely we are aware of those restrictions, and some of the programs where we need to grow, we have those very restrictions on laboratories or facilities. And so, we've been thinking about can we launch a cohort that maybe is an evening cohort for non-traditional students that would get away from the facility concern. But we'll still run through our equipment a little faster than we would normally, and we have to look at faculty workload. But right now, we don't have the freedom to invest in that way, because we really are trying to do everything we've always done and not making room for who are we as an institution in that future. But absolutely that is part of the complexity of this.

**D. Johnson** stated I'll just go right to the most kind of inflammatory argument, which is you mentioned Indiana and what we're seeing is the weaponization of this low performing metrics as part of an attack on higher education in this country. There are a lot of traditional programs on your list that are never going to have 40 majors, and you're just not going to have 40 majors in any given language. You're not going to have 40 majors in linguistics; this is to speak of my school. I understand the constraints. I mean money, financial constraints are important. What I don't see, and maybe it's just because I don't have visibility to it, is university administrations talking to state legislatures and saying that we value things like philosophy, language study, chemistry was on the list, obviously a field dear to your heart, and we're committed to doing these things because we believe in science, we believe in the humanities, and we believe that higher education is about more than job training. If we as faculty and as administrators are not making that case, no one's going to make it for us. And

it's not that these programs in sciences and humanities are necessarily doing a bad job. You didn't say that. It's just that they've always had fairly small enrollments, and they're going to continue to have small enrollments. So, I guess it's just what I'm seeing is only sort of one side of the ledger - job preparation and the numbers, and I'm not seeing any awareness of the context, which is profoundly anti-intellectual. Not so much in Illinois yet, but this is the rhetoric they used in Indiana to hide behind wanting to reduce critical inquiry and wanting to undermine humanities and science. **Provost Tucker** stated I don't disagree with anything you said. I believe in education for the sake of education - that it does not have to lead to a job. We as an institution, though, have to decide what we want to be, who we are and what are our ideals. And that's why I said there are some things we will always do here irrespective, right? And there's a couple of entities on campus that are very expensive. The SIU Press - I'm not calling them out, but giving voice to the voiceless is part of who we are. That is part of our ideology as an institution.

So, that's what we have to look at and decide what do we want to be going forward. There will be some degree programs we will never have 40 students in. What does that look like? But our student-to-faculty ratio is very, very low and does not reflect our peer institutions who also are thinking the same things that we are. Many of them have kept the things that make them uniquely them, but also have been able to build out other programs that students are interested in. We do have to address some of the workforce needs relative to say, nursing, right? Healthcare is very important to every single one of us and we need to be educating more of those students and figuring out how do we do that. But I do believe you should be able to come to higher education institution and get a degree because you happen to be interested in that. And having an educated electorate is absolutely critical to us as a society. So, I don't disagree with you at all.

**J. Remo** asked how do we get creative and what are the constraints about reorganizing ourselves to where we are efficient? **Provost Tucker** stated what I found here is IBHE is the least restrictive of most places I have been. So, typically specializations in other states have to share 50% of the content of an undergraduate degree. And APAP Julie Dunston verified for me that IBHE does not have that rule. So, sometimes we put some things together, maybe that don't make sense, but we do have opportunities to put some unique degrees together, like you said, in an environmental science, environmental policy. I want to hear unique and creative ideas. I want to support that and help you get there in any way that we can so that you can have a sustainable program, and your faculty can feel really great about how you're engaged with our students, whether they be undergraduates or graduates. We do know looking at IBHE just recently that they have very few restrictions on some of the creative things we could do with our degree programs. So, I would welcome some feedback from you as you discussed.

**VCR Tsatsoulis** stated I've said this before many times and I will say it again. We need to encourage our faculty to advertise a 4+1 program. It will allow our best students to stay, to get a degree, to populate our classes, and to make extra money when they graduate. I've seen it in other places as recruiting for parents of freshmen. Parents love programs like that, because they believe that their son or daughter will be able to make it. So please, we need more of those programs. We will be working with the Graduate Council; we already started working with them last year. We'll be working with them to make graduate certificates and terminal degrees in cases where the faculty agree to do so, right now they're not. This will increase the number of students in our classrooms who may also be able to transition to a master's, and it will give an opportunity to master's students for some reason who need to stop to exit with a degree. So, this is something that we're going to work with the Graduate Council for next year.

**c. VCR/Dean of Graduate School: Dr. Tsatsoulis**

VCR Tsatsoulis stated our graduate enrollment is up by about 3.6%, 68 students. That's the good news. The bad news is our international enrollments are down by about 12%, and I do not expect that to change. I wanted to let you know that yesterday the Graduate School sent to the Directors, the Deans, and the Directors of Graduate Studies a message saying that effective today, we will stop processing international applications, and we will ask all these applications to be deferred to spring

2026. The reason is that even if we admit the students now, they won't be able to get a visa for fall 2025, and we want to focus on a domestic applicants. Our domestic applicants right now yield about 60%, which is extremely important. We expect the domestic applicants will yield about 70% at the end of the year. By yield, I mean if they get admitted, they enroll and they show up. Our international applicants right now, their yield is about 10%. In other words, they've been admitted and enrolled, but we don't know how many of them will be able to come. The reason we're doing that is because between June 1st and today we received more than fifty additional graduate applications that have been in the bins of the schools ready to be processed. So, we want to make sure that we focus our limited staff, both at the school and college and Graduate School level on domestic applicants, because we know that international applicants will probably not be able to make it. And we are asking them to be deferred for the spring. By the way, there will be exceptions. It's possible that an international student is in the US already and has a visa or something like that. So, exceptions will be made, and the colleges need to ask for that.

**K. Meksem** mentioned about there being a huge delay in processing contracts for graduate students. **VCR Tsatsoulis** stated the person responsible for graduate contracts is temporarily not here. We also have a person who's doing registrations who's temporarily not here. So, we have an extra hep person who's trying to do both. We also have Dr. Karen Jones who learned how to do contracts to help as much as she can with that. This is definitely a priority that we're trying to do as much as we can. As you know, these contracts are either on the system or on paper, depending on whether the student is returning or if it's a new student. That has created some additional paperwork and confusion, but we're trying to go through it with two people missing. These positions require substantial training. We have about 850 GAs at SIU. What is missing is that we have no integration with a lot of our systems. **Chancellor Lane** stated to VCR Tsatsoulis - bring the recommendation to me, the Provost, and VC Susan Simmers, and let's fix it.

**D. Johnson** asked if students are facing greater difficulties getting visas this year. **VCR Tsatsoulis** stated the embassy stopped giving visas for 30 days. That puts substantial difficulty in getting the visas on time. We're hearing anecdotally that appointments are being made, but they're eight weeks in the future. And I think the best person to answer some of these questions, because he follows them carefully, would be Peter Li from Center for International Education. (K. Meksem asked Melissa to put Peter Li on the September agenda.)

**Note:** K. Meksem thanked the administration and asked them to log off the meeting and let the faculty stay on to discuss matters. Faculty discussed the following concerns: reduction in staff, no real plan, course mergers, advertising/our brand – variety & number of programs we offer, tension among faculty, restructuring programs, bad publicity, questionable morale, and issues with Teams/loss of telephones/not getting calls/using personal cell phones.

- X.      **Adjournment****  
**Motion:** J. Sherry  
**Second:** J. Remo