FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Mississippi/Illinois Room, Morris University Center
Zoom Meeting ID 989 5051 4481
March 3, 2022 – 2:30pm
APPROVED MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 2:33pm on Thursday, March 3, 2022 by President E. Duff Wrobbel.

Present: E. Duff Wrobbel, Jingyi Jia, Laurie Rice, Robert Bitter, Heidy Carruthers, Kim Carter, Wai Cheah, David Cluphf, Ivy Cooper, Igor Crk, Chaya Gopalan, Valerie Griffin, Mitchell Haas, Michael Hair, James Hanlon, Cedrick Harville II, Keith Hecht, Amy Hubert, Heather Johnson, Angela Kim, Joshua Kryah, Soondo Kweon, Yuliang Liu, Yun Lu, Ram Madupalli, Adriana Martinez, Cassandra Maynard, Barb McCracken, Kelley McGuire, J. Thad Meeks, Ann Popkess (ex officio), Corey Ragsdale, Alison Reiheld, Johanna Schmitz, Kamran Shavezipur, Michael Shaw, Walter Siganga, Jayme Swanke, Ezra Temko, Carrie Vogler, Suranjan Weeraratne, Susan Wiediger (ex officio), Jie Ying, Xudong Yu, Jennifer Zuercher

Absent: Charles Berger (ex officio), Kevin Cannon, R. Duane Douglas (ex officio), Carole Frick, Kay Gaehle, Jennifer Hernandez, Christienne Hinz, Stephen Kerber (ex officio), Nima Lotfi Yagin, Shadrack Msengi, Edward Navarre, Debbie Sellnow-Richmond, Prince Wells (ex officio)

Guest: Keith Becherer

Guest:
Chancellor Dr. James Minor was a guest at the meeting. He shared his priorities of student success and budget focus, noting that it is necessary to change as an institution in order to go forward. He stated that he wants a communal knowledge of how the university is doing with student success and sees a collective responsibility to improve outcomes.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Announcements:
Announcements were reviewed as listed on the agenda.

Consideration of Minutes:
The minutes for the December 2, 2021 meeting were approved as written.

Action Items:
There were no action items.

Unfinished Business:

Weather cancellations have been an obstacle, but there is still an intent to get through reorganization before the end of the semester. The Faculty Senate Reorganization Ad Hoc Committee (FSRAC) recommends keeping Welfare and the Faculty Development Councils as separate, but the size needs to be evaluated since they have less responsibility. The Rules & Procedures Council is recommended to be rebranded as the Governance Council. The current Bylaws do not reflect what Councils do, and the hope is to have new Bylaws verbiage to look at in April.

A Bylaws proposal was shared in teams, and the Modified Feminist Process will be a separate discussion. Temko moved to adopt the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws with the exception of the Modified Feminist Process changes, and it was seconded by Hecht. There was a discussion, and it was noted that if changes are not made this year the fall semester would have to start with the existing structure instead of the new Council structure. The motion carried with 34 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions (Bitter – NO, Carruthers – ABSTAIN, Carter – YES, Cheah – YES, Cluphf – YES, Cooper – YES, Crk – YES, Foster – YES, Gopalan – YES, Griffin – NO, Haas – YES, Hair – YES, Hanlon – YES, Harville – YES, Hecht – YES, Hubert – YES, Johnson – YES, Kim – YES, Kryah – YES, Kweon – YES, Liu – YES, Lu – YES, Madupalli – YES, Martinez – YES, Maynard – YES, McCracken – NO, McGuire – YES, Ragsdale – YES, Reiheld – ABSTAIN, Schmitz – YES, Shaw – YES, Siganga – YES, Swanke – YES, Temko – YES, Vogler – YES, Weeraratne – YES, Ying – YES, Yu – YES, Zuercher – YES).

There was further discussion about the proposal to move from Robert's Rules of Order (RONR) to a Feminist Process. There is a discussion about parliamentary process among Presidents of Faculty Senates in the state. Bitter suggested using a simplified version of RONR called Sturgiss, which is fairly commonly used. The Modified Feminist Process is supposed to be a more inclusive form of meeting management, but not many know what it is and have concerns about a high learning curve. Wrobbel suggested the Senate use the Modified Feminist Process at the April meeting and run through some examples.

New Business:
There are no nominations for President-Elect.

Masks are now optional everywhere except in instructional spaces. It is expected that testing will stop at the end of the month. There was no further discussion on the topic.

Reports from Standing Committees:
The University Planning and Budget Committee (UPBC) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council (IBHE-FAC) reports were posted to Teams and are attached.

Reports from Council Chairs:
The Faculty Development Council tried to get funding for those who applied to the Excellence in Undergraduate Education (EUE) in 2020, but there is nothing available for this year. The Continuous Improvement Conference will take place on March 18, and information will be coming out to all faculty about the conference. The Teaching Excellence Award Committee (TEAC) was impacted by the

pandemic, and it is uncertain what will be done for it this year. They are working on making it equitable to faculty who teach online as well as amending the Bylaws to help secure a Chair for the committee.

The Curriculum Council is working on program reviews and will add a meeting due to the February Council meeting cancellation due to inclement weather. Hecht recognized the Undergraduate Programs Committee for their work on getting courses through CurricuNET.

The Graduate Council voted by email to accept committee reports, but their normal meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather.

Rice reported that the Meridian Selection Committee chose recipients and shared that departments might get requests to reach out to students to encourage them to accept.

Jia noted that the April meeting will be in-person and that March Council meetings will also take place in-person.

There were no other reports.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 4:12 pm.

Submitted by Anne Hunter, University Governance

FACULTY SENATE MEETING - AGENDA
Mississippi/Illinois Room, Morris University Center
Zoom Meeting ID: 989 5051 4481, Password: chimega
March 3, 2022 – 2:30 PM

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

II. **PUBLIC COMMENT***

III. **GUEST**
   a. Chancellor Dr. James T. Minor

IV. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
   a. Continuous Improvement Conference – March 18
   b. Board of Trustees Meeting – April 28 in Carbondale
   c. Director of Human Resources Search Committee Appointment – Gertrude Pannirselvam

V. **CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**
   a. December 2, 2021

VI. **ACTION ITEMS**

VII. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
   a. Faculty Senate Reorganization
   b. Modified Feminist Process

VIII. **NEW BUSINESS**
   a. Nominations for President-Elect
   b. COVID and On-Ground Concerns

IX. **REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**
   a. UPBC – Ann Popkess
   b. IBHE Faculty Advisory Council – Susan Wiediger

X. **REPORTS FROM COUNCIL CHAIRS**
   a. Faculty Development Council – Kim Carter & Alison Reiheld
   b. Curriculum Council – Keith Hecht
   c. Rules & Procedures Council – Kamran Shavezipur
   d. Welfare and Governance Council – Robert Bitter & Igor Crk
   e. Graduate Council – Barbara McCracken
   f. Past-President – Laurie Rice
   g. President-Elect – Jane Jia
   h. President – Duff Wrobbel

XI. **ADJOURNMENT**

Next Faculty Senate Meeting Thursday, April 7 at 2:30 p.m.

*The Faculty Senate is accepting public comments via email to encourage social distancing and safety. Submitted comments will be read aloud during the meeting and added to the minutes. Please submit any comments to the University Governance Office at anhunte@siue.edu prior to the start of the meeting.

The below proposed changes to the FS bylaws, to be in effect beginning with the 2022/2023 AY:

A. Create a new council: University Budget, Finance, & Operations Council (UBFO). Create a new committee: Academic & Support Services, under the proposed UBFO Council. Outlines responsibilities of this new council and requires overlap of at least two Faculty Senators on UPBC and UBFO. Operating procedures will need to be developed and approved for UBFO if this passes.
B. Adds a responsibility to the Rules & Procedures Council of helping track committee appointments and make committee appointment recommendations.
C. Combines the Faculty Grievance & Family-Friendly Leave Request committees.
D. Add student success to the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Curriculum Council's Academic Standards and Policies Committee, with the Undergraduate Curriculum Council responsibilities updated to reflect this.
E. Creates a new committee: Non-represented Faculty Welfare Committee, under the Welfare & Governance Council.
F. Move from Roberts Rules to a FS-approved modified feminist process, which will need to be customized and adopted if this passes.
G. Clarifies Executive Committee roles/responsibilities, including removing the specification that the Executive Committee can convene FS over the summer.
H. Changes council membership requirements from having 6-12 faculty senators to having at least 3 faculty senators.
I. Moves some high-level responsibilities regarding policies and practices (e.g., board statutes, academic governance practice/policy review and formulation, structure and organizational relationships within the system) from Welfare & Governance and Rules & Procedures and gives them broadly to the Faculty Senate and to all councils as relevant.

The Faculty Senate Bylaws
I. Membership and Representation in the Faculty Senate

B.

Faculty members appointed as representatives to the University Planning and Budget Council who are not regularly elected members of the Faculty Senate shall become at-large, non-voting members of the Senate. At least two of the faculty senators appointed to UPBC shall be senators who are assigned to the University Budget, Finance, & Operations Council. Faculty members appointed as representatives to the Illinois Board of Higher Education who are not regularly elected members of the Faculty Senate shall become at-large, non-voting members of the Senate.

II. Meetings

A. The Faculty Senate shall schedule regular meetings, generally at least once a month during the academic year, or more frequently if its responsibilities require. Normally, the Faculty Senate will not meet during the months of June, July, and August, unless convened by the Executive Committee.

C. The Faculty Senate shall conduct its business under recognized parliamentary procedures, as specified in the Faculty Senate's approved Modified Feminist Process Robert's Rules of Order, and shall appoint as needed its parliamentarian annually.

IV. Executive Committee

B. The Executive Committee shall function as a steering committee to help enable and facilitate the Faculty Senate working effectively. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for the agenda of meetings of the Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee shall respond to matters presented to it by individual faculty members and may place such matters on the agenda, as it deems necessary.

E. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for liaising with internal bodies such as Student Senate and University Staff Senate.

V. Councils

A. The Faculty Senate shall establish the following standing Councils:

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Council

2. Faculty Development Council

3. Rules and Procedures Council

4. Welfare and Governance Council

5. University Budget, Finance, & Operations Council

65. Graduate Council, as described in Article V, Section C of the Faculty Senate Constitution.

C. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall appoint Faculty Senate members to each Council. Such membership shall be composed of at least six three to twelve members of the Faculty Senate. Councils may add additional members from outside Faculty Senate; representatives added from other campus constituency groups shall be voting members.

H. The Faculty Senate shall be responsible for recommending possible changes in the Board Statutes to the Board of Trustees; reviewing current practices and policies in the area of academic governance and formulating guidelines for the administration and governance of all academic units; formulating and recommending to the Faculty Senate policy relating to the structure, functioning, and funding of the Southern Illinois University system and the organizational relationships among and between the Board of Trustees, the President, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, the School of Medicine, and Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. When relevant, this charge may be taken up by any council, the Executive Committee, and/or the Faculty Senate as a body.

HI. Additional functions and responsibilities of the Faculty Senate Councils and Standing Committees are as follows:

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Council

a. Functions: The Undergraduate Curriculum Council is responsible to the Faculty Senate for formulating and recommending policy on undergraduate curriculum (instructional programs; courses of study; definitions of certificates, diplomas, degrees, student entrance, retention and exit), for formulating and reviewing undergraduate curricular policy proposals, for reviewing the administration of all undergraduate curricular matters, and for conducting undergraduate program reviews. The council is also responsible to the Faculty Senate for all matters of undergraduate student success related to academic and faculty interest, such as advising, academic probation, conduct, and housing, as well as liaising with Student Senate. "Undergraduate" shall be defined as including both dental and continuing education.

b. Standing Committees: Academic Standards and, Policies, and Student Success Committee, Committee on Assessment, General Education Committee, Graduation Appeals Committee, Undergraduate Courses Committee, and Undergraduate Programs Committee.

3. Rules and Procedures Council

a. Functions: The Rules and Procedures Council is charged with recommendations pertaining to structuring the Faculty Senate, specifically the reapportionment of Senate seats, seating and unseating Senators, and the election of Senate Officers; examining the academic governance of the University per se including name changes and/or the restructuring of departments and schools; liaison with internal bodies , e.g. Student Senate, University Staff Senate, etc.; evaluation of the Chancellor and the Provost and Vice Chancellor; as needed, recommending committee appointments to the Faculty Senate president and coordinating with the University Governance Office to track committee appointments; ~~recommending possible changes in the Board Statutes to the Board of Trustees; reviewing current practices and policies in the area of academic governance and formulating guidelines for the administration and governance of all academic units~~.

b. Standing Committees: Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Evaluation and Liaison Committee, and Personnel Committee.

4. Welfare and Governance Council

a. Functions: The Welfare and Governance Council is responsible for the following: ~~formulating and recommending to the Faculty Senate policy relating to the structure, functioning, and funding of the Southern Illinois University system and the organizational relationships among and between the Board of Trustees, the President, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, the School of Medicine, and Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.~~ On behalf of the SIUE faculty (as defined in the Faculty Senate Constitution) not represented under a current labor contract, the Welfare and Governance Council shall concern itself with all policies for faculty evaluation, salary, promotions, tenure, leaves of absence, recruitment, employment, retraining, development, rights and responsibilities, general faculty benefits, discipline, severance, and grievance.

b. Standing Committees: Faculty Benefits and Facilities Committee, Faculty Salary Equity Committee, Faculty Status Committee, Honorary Degree and Distinguished Service Award Committee, Faculty Grievance ~~Committee, and University Committee for~~and ~~Family~~ Family-Friendly ~~Policy~~ Leave Request Committee; Non-represented Faculty Welfare~~Implementation~~.

5. University Budget, Finance, & Operations Council

a. Functions: The University Budget, Finance, & Operations Council is responsible to the Faculty Senate for all matters relating to faculty participation in university budgeting, for liaising with Staff Senate, for attention to sustainability, for providing oversight on academic matters relating to the academic calendar, counseling, technology, and support services.

b: Standing Committees: Academic & Support Services

From 3-25-21 FSEC Meeting:

- The ByLaw Proposal document in the meeting folder referenced to changing from Robert's Rules of Order (RONR) to the modified feminist process:

  The Faculty Senate's operating procedures were changed from using Robert's Rules of Order to a modified feminist process that is oriented towards inclusion, order, and efficiency. It is considered "modified" because it uses majority voting as a decision mechanism (as opposed to consensus) and because it is tailored to the structure and needs of the body (e.g. allowing the president to facilitate all meetings rather than having facilitation rotate each meeting).

- The ByLaw Proposal text in the meeting folder included the revised text for Section II.C.:

  The Faculty Senate shall conduct its business as specified in the Faculty Senate's approved Modified Feminist Process, and shall appoint as needed its parliamentarian annually.

From 4-1-21 Faculty Senate Meeting:

- DraftByLawProposal.040121Memo in Additional Changes section:

  It is proposed to change the Faculty Senate's operating procedures from using Robert's Rules of Order to a modified feminist process that is oriented towards inclusion, order, and efficiency. It is considered "modified" because it uses majority voting as a decision mechanism (as opposed to consensus) and because it is tailored to the structure and needs of the body (e.g. allowing the president to facilitate all meetings rather than having facilitation rotate each meeting).

- The ByLaw Proposal text included the revised text for Section II.C.:

  The Faculty Senate shall conduct its business as specified in the Faculty Senate's approved Modified Feminist Process, and shall appoint as needed its parliamentarian annually.

- The FS.Sample-Modified-Feminist-Process document was first introduced (attached below).

- From the minutes:

  Proposed amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws were reviewed, which includes

several changes that have come over the past year. Language on committee appointments and representation on University committees was added, the eligibility to serve as President-Elect was expanded to current and former Senators, the size of the Senate was given flexibility to adjust for reapportionment as needed, binary gender references were removed, and the rules of order would change from Robert's Rules to the Modified Feminist Process.

From 4-8-21 FSEC Meeting:

- The minutes note that the proposal to change from Robert's Rules of Order to the Modified Feminist Process was reviewed, and an example document was provided; the document was the same as presented to the full Senate (attached below).

From the All Faculty Meeting on 9-30-21:

- The Faculty Senate Reorganization presentation included information about the change to the feminist process in the review of the AY 20/21 Reorganization Working Group. It was listed as one of the proposal areas that had general agreement.

From the 11-4-21 Faculty Senate Meeting:

- The Reorganization ByLaw Proposal document outlined the changes suggested to be in effect beginning with the 2022/2023AY. Item F: "Move from Roberts Rules to a FS-approved modified feminist process, which will need to be customized and adopted if this passes." It also included the proposed language covered in the 4-1-21 Faculty Senate meeting.

Sample Modified Feminist Process: Quick Guide

■ **Meetings start with Check-ins, where who is in the room is acknowledged/introduced, along with their role.**
Guests introduce themselves and share their purpose for attending the meeting.

■ **Guests**
  ○ Welcome! If you are bringing an item to this body, you will be placed under *Outside Business*. This is always at the beginning of the meeting, right after Check-ins.
  ○ After you have discussed your item, you are welcome to leave or to stay for part of or the rest of our meeting. Our meetings are open to the public.
  ○ You may fully participate in discussions, but you may not make proposals, make process suggestions, give general feelings, or vote.

■ **Discussion Protocol:**
  1. **Introduction** of a proposal or topic
  2. **Clarifying questions:** objective, factual questions that aim to clarify the proposal. This is not time to voice opinions on the proposal.
  3. **Discussion:** Moves through a "stack," the list of the persons wishing to speak. The facilitator takes stack; stack is not first-come first-serve; the facilitator is encouraged to use stack to adjust power dynamics and strive towards consensus (e.g. someone who has not yet contributed to the conversation may "jump" stack, meaning they move to the front of the list to speak).
  4. **General feelings** are taken on voting.
  5. **Voting:** a majority must vote in favor of a proposal for a proposal to pass.

■ **How to:**
  ○ **Speak:** ✋ Signal the facilitator who will place you on stack, the list of persons wishing to speak.
  ○ **Register your agreement with something being said:** Knock lightly on the table (or in the air if there is no table).
  ○ **Jump stack to ask a clarifying question:** Signal the facilitator, making a *c* with your hand, to ask a clarifying question to someone who has just spoken.
  ○ **Request the opportunity to jump stack to give a direct response:** Signal the facilitator, making a *d* with your hand, to ask someone who has just spoken if you have factual information to provide regarding their statement. If the person does not give you permission to provide a direct response and you would still like to make your comment, you can signal the facilitator to be added to stack.

■ **How to – for voting members only:**
  ○ **Make a process suggestion or proposal:** Signal the facilitator, making a *p* with your hand. These always jump stack and do not require a second.
  ○ **Give general feelings:**
     👍 = positive   👎 = negative
     ✊ = indifferent, apathetic, or mixed
  ○ **Vote:** Raise your hand when a vote is called (most common voting process).

Sample Modified Feminist Process: Procedural Guidelines

Section 1. General Procedures

A. All meetings of this body are open to the public. If meetings are held in a room with a closed door, a note must be placed on the door.

B. Minutes will be taken at all official meetings of the body; they will be a matter of public record and available online. Minutes will include the names of the voting members present and voting members absent, and any guests present. Minutes are subject to review and approval of the body they are for.

C. Sixty (60) percent (rounded to nearest whole number) of the filled voting positions of the body constitutes a quorum necessary for conducting regular business. If fewer than this number are present, business proceeds as usual unless a voting member calls quorum, in which case the meeting can continue with discussion but no votes may be taken.

Section 2: Agenda for Meetings

The Executive Committee is responsible for the meeting agenda. Any voting member in good standing may propose adding an item to the agenda by contacting the President. Any proposed items will be considered by the President and/or Executive Committee for inclusion on an upcoming agenda or otherwise referred to the appropriate venue for consideration.

The standard agenda items are as follows and come in this order:

A. Check Ins and Introductions of Guests: Guests are introduced as they come in or at the beginning of the meeting. Members-at-Large, voting members, and ex-officio non-voting members are introduced by academic unit and council.

B. Approval of the Minutes: changes to the last meeting's minutes are noted; the minutes are approved by general feelings.

C. Approval of the agenda: additions may be made, approved by general feelings.

D. Outside Business: Any business that a guest proposes takes precedence over internal business.

E. Reports: Officers, council chairs, and committee appointees give updates or raise items that are relevant for the body's consideration.

F. Internal Business: All of the body's business falls under this category.

G. Check-outs and Evaluations: At the end of the meeting, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the meeting went and to comment on the process of the meeting. Important considerations include whether the process was followed, the effectiveness of the facilitation, whether everyone got a chance to participate, whether the discussion was

intimidating or uncomfortable, etc. Both positive and negative points should be raised and solutions offered. Use this time for constructive criticism.

Section 3. Proposals

A. Proposals may only be made by voting members in good standing, although the authors need not be voting members.

B. All proposals deemed by the author or proposer as meriting a formal vote are to be submitted in writing at least three days directly preceding the meeting at which they are to be proposed. Counter-proposals that arise in the course of a discussion are exempt from this process. If possible, members should be given the time to look over a proposal and give suggestions before meetings.

C. Written proposals should include a motion, background on the motion, pros and cons regarding the motion, and other considerations related to the proposal. Only the actual motion will be voted on.

Section 4. Procedure for Discussions
Discussion topics and proposals are handled as follows:

A. Discussion of a proposal begins with an **introduction** by the person making the proposal or bringing forth the discussion topic. The introduction should always specify the body's role in the proposal (whether to vote on it, consider it, etc.)

B. The floor is then open for **clarifying questions**, which should be objective and factual. The time for clarifying questions is restricted to questions that are objective, factual, and aim to clarify the proposal. For instance, "when will this proposal take effect?" is acceptable, but "Isn't this proposal a bad idea?" is not. Before moving on to general discussion, all of the members should fully understand what is being discussed.

C. Only after all clarifying questions have been asked is the floor open for **general discussion**, which is the time for members and guests to offer their opinion, debate, and suggest any amendments.

> 1. The facilitator takes stack, the list of persons wishing to speak. The facilitator will call on persons to speak. If someone wishes to speak, that person must signal to the facilitator, who will write down the name of that person. The facilitator may also designate another member to take stack.
>
> 2. A speaker is permitted to request a **direct response** from a specific individual, so long as the direct response is factual in nature.

D. Moving towards a vote

1. Before a vote, a proposal's sponsor is allowed a minute for **closing remarks**, and should restate the wording of the proposal, to the extent that it is unwritten or has been modified, so that all are clear about what it means to be "in favor."

2. When discussion is finished, the body should move into a vote on any proposals or move onto its next agenda item. When one or more proposals are on the table and stack has been finished, the facilitator asks for general feelings on voting or for a different process suggestion.

   a. If general feelings are negative, the proposal may be discussed further, tabled, or sent to a subgroup for revisions.

   b. If general feelings are positive but there were thumbs pointed down, the facilitator asks if any voting member has a major objection to voting. Any voting member who objects explains why and there is a brief discussion only about the objection. If the dispute cannot be resolved through compromise, the facilitator calls for a formal vote to override the objection and normal procedures follow.

Section 4. Process Suggestions are ways of steering the direction of discussion and can contribute greatly to efficiency. Process suggestions can be made at any time, without waiting for stack, and require an immediate vote. To make a process suggestion, signal the facilitator by forming a P with your hand. Only voting members may make process suggestions.

Some common process suggestions are:

1. *"I move to close stack"*—if approved, anybody who wants to join stack has one final opportunity to do so and then it is closed. When stack is exhausted, discussion is over. Note: another useful process suggestion is to reopen stack.

2. *"I move to table this proposal"*—Tabling a proposal removes it from discussion during that meeting. This proposal is appropriate if a proposal is taking too much time when there are other pressing matters, or if it needs more work. Stack does not finish if a proposal is tabled.

3. *"I move to limit speaking time to X minutes"*—If this motion passes, a timekeeper clocks each speech and calls "time" when a speaker has reached the limit. This motion applies only to a specific discussion and not to the rest of the meeting. The process suggestion is useful at particularly verbose meetings or when facilitation has not been aggressive. Strict time limits, however, can hamper serious discussion of complex issues and may make people uncomfortable.

5. *"I move to limit/extend discussion time to X more minutes"*—Sets or extends a time limit to the discussion. When the time runs out, stack is considered closed.

Section 10. Voting

There are several types of votes. Each is more appropriate than others for certain situations.

    A. Process Voting

        1. Process votes includes all process suggestions and simple organizational matters, such as closing stack, internal appointments, or setting a date for a meeting.

        2. Process votes are decided by general feelings, a system set up to frequently take the pulse of the group.

        3. Voting members indicate their vote with a thumbs-up, thumbs-down, or thumbs to the side (indicating indifference).

        4. The facilitator decides whether the thumb array indicates general feelings of mostly positive, mostly negative, or mixed.

            a. If the response is mixed, the body should return to discussion, while positive or negative response indicates passed or rejected, respectively.

            b. If response is mostly positive with a few strong negatives, the facilitator should ask the objectors to state their objection and a brief discussion of the objection may ensue.

            c. If a dispute cannot be resolved through compromise, a formal vote should be taken.

        5. Any voting member may call for a formal vote instead of general feelings at any time.

    B. Formal Voting

        1. Every present voting member must vote. A voting member may vote for or against a proposal, or abstain.

        2. There are three kinds of formal votes, listed here in order of increasing formality. Any voting member may call for a more formal method of voting at any time.

            a. The **hand vote** is used for most formal proposals and for issues too contentious to be decided by a simple process vote.

                1) Hands are raised in favor, against, and in abstention, and the number of each is recorded by the University Governance Office Support Specialist or designee.

b. The **roll call** vote is used for any issue deemed too important for a hand vote.

  1) In roll call votes, the names of all voting members are called and their names and votes recorded. The roll call tabulation explicitly notes which voting members are absent on a given vote.

c. Since roll call votes are given one at a time, there is the possibility that one member's vote may influence another's vote. If a voting member suspects this may be an issue, that member should call for a **ballot vote**.

  1) In a ballot vote, all votes are written down on paper or electronically submitted, along with the voter's name. The votes tabulated by the by the University Governance Office Support Specialist or designee. The names of the voting members are recorded along with their votes. Absences are also noted.

  2) Because Faculty Senate is a public body, secret ballots (in which case members do not write their names on their ballots) are prohibited.

3. Approval Voting

  a. When a number of proposals are on the floor, and especially, for example, when approval is being sought for a long list of items, **slate voting** may be used to hold one formal vote for the entire list, called a slate. Any voting member in good standing may unilaterally pull an item from the slate for discussion or to be voted on separately.

  b. When two or more conflicting proposals are up for a vote at the same time, an **approval vote** may be held to determine which proposal will be accepted, if any. A hand vote is taken on each proposal to determine which of the competing proposals is the most popular. Members may vote for as many of the competing proposals as they wish, but they may not vote against any. The most popular proposal is then subjected to a formal vote to determine whether it passes. If the proposal does not pass, the proposal receiving the next most votes in approval voting is voted on, and so on, until a proposal passes or all have failed.

4. Online Voting may be occasionally necessary if there is a time-sensitive matter that may need a more immediate vote. This should be avoided if at all possible as proper discussion cannot be had. However, it is occasionally necessary. The Executive Committee may determine a process to use, usually allowing a certain amount of time for online discussion before voting begins. This process must comply with state law, including that the voting takes place within the context of a meeting (e.g. electronic gathering) that is in a publicly-accessible electronic format.

5. If a voting member is unable to attend for good cause, that member is expected to have their designated alternate attend the meeting to attend in their place. There is no other form of proxy or absentee voting.

    a. Members who will be absent from a meeting may send a written statement to the University Governance Office Support Specialist to be presented at said meeting.

C. Determining if a proposal passes

1. Unless otherwise specified, all formal votes are decided by majority.

2. For all votes more formal than general feelings, abstentions are considered to count toward quorum for the vote. For example:

    1) If a vote is 2 for and 3 against, with 10 abstentions, the proposal would fail due to a lack of support, not because the abstentions invalidated the vote.

    2) If a vote requires a 2/3 majority of those voting, and the vote is 9 for and 4 against, with 2 abstentions, the vote would fail. A two-thirds majority is 10 in this case, 2/3 of those present, not 9, 2/3 of those voting and not abstaining.

    3) For all votes where half of those voting are in favor, and fewer than half are opposed, the motion will carry. For example, a vote of 8-7-1 will pass.

    4) If a vote is 3 for and 2 against, with 10 abstentions, the proposal would pass. There are more votes in favor than opposed, and the abstentions count towards quorum for the vote.

Feminist Process: Philosophy, Rationale, & Considerations

Section 1. Why a feminist process?

    A. A feminist process is an inclusion and consensus-oriented way of structuring debate. This system of conducting business is intended to address the disparity of power in our society and make sure that everyone is heard.

    B. The aim of a feminist process is to allow for consensus-based decisions that take into account all divergent viewpoints. This is mainly accomplished by structuring debate to include more people through a voting procedure that lets an individual voice strong concerns in a prominent manner. It strives for consensus, though it does not mandate it, but by incorporating everyone's ideas attempts to reach a compromise with which everyone can live.

    C. Its development is linked to awareness that inclusive and positive processes are central to an organization's ability to serve the interests of its constituents.

Section 2. Principles of the Feminist Process (from Wheeler & Chin 1991)

    A. The Power of Letting Go- encourages change emerging out of awareness of collective integrity; leadership inspires a balance between the interests of each individual and the group; between self-knowledge and cooperation.

    B. The Power of the Whole- values the flow of new ideas; images and energy from all, nurturing mutual help networks that are both intimate and expansive. The sharing of knowledge and skills is viewed as healthy and desirable.

    C. The Power of Collectivity- values the personal power of each individual. A group decision where each individual has participated in reaching consensus is viewed as more viable than a decision made by any one individual and stronger than a decision made by a majority.

    D. The Power of Unity- shares the responsibility for decision-making and for acting upon those decisions in a lateral network. This process values thoughtful deliberation and emphasizes the integration of variety within the group through the process of transforming conflict.

    E. The Power of Sharing- encourages leadership to shift according to talent, interest, ability, or skill; emphasizes the passing along of knowledge and skills in order that all may develop individual talent.

    F. The Power of Integration- views situations in context without arbitrary value-laden judgments. In the process of participating all members act with self respect and respect towards other participants.

G. The Power of Distribution- takes into account disparities in material resources that may be present among different individuals in the group or in the society as a whole. The need to equitably share these resources is respected.

H. The Power of Diversity – encourages creativity, values alternative views, and encourages flexibility. The expression of dissenting views is expected and all points of view are integrated into decisions.

I. The Power of Responsibility – focuses on demystification of the processes and insists on naming and/or being the agent. Open criticism and self-criticism is encouraged, motivated by respect and for the betterment of the individual and the group.

Section 3. What we are trying to avoid

A. Meetings where two people argue back and forth for the whole time and nothing gets done.

B. Meetings where some people are never heard because of interruptions by others.

C. Voting on measures when some feel that their concerns have not been addressed or listened to.

D. Meetings where critical decisions have been already been made behind closed doors or among a select subset of the group.

E. Meetings that leave the group exhausted, frustrated, angry and/or thinking "there has got to be a better way."

F. Most importantly, we must avoid being crippled by tyrannies of silence or repetition. Whenever individuals stay silent when their viewpoint has not been expressed they deprive the group of the benefit of a viewpoint that otherwise will not be taken into account. On the other hand, not every individual needs to address every issue. If your viewpoint has already been expressed you need not repeat what has already been said, although it may be important to signify that you agree with what has been said, which is normally done by lightly knocking on the table.

Section 4. Facilitation

A. Feminist Process requires competent facilitation. If this is in place, then meetings can be productive and empowering. Good facilitation helps the group focus and act in a democratic way and gives everyone an equal chance to participate.

B. Good Facilitators:

1. Make sure the environment is conducive to group participation through the elimination of side conversations and other disturbances.

2. Make sure that the participants know what is being asked of them, whether it's general discussion or a more specific process, such as voting.

3. Carefully think about on whom to call, when, and how often. They do not let a few people dominate the conversation, which is why stack is not first come, first serve. People often don't participate if they are uncomfortable with the dynamics; the facilitator's job is to make them feel comfortable while stressing the importance of participation.

4. Often the facilitator does not take a strong role in voicing concerns and issues. When the facilitator does voice the facilitator's views, that person needs to make a distinction before the comment between the person's role as a facilitator and the person's role as a participant. Co-facilitation is also allowed, and may be beneficial.

5. Do not let people speak out of turn, nor let them engage in back and forth dialogue.

6. Do not let people ramble or become repetitious—a facilitator breaking in on someone who is doing this should not be viewed by the speaker as a personal insult, but rather as an important key to keeping the discussion moving.

7. Go into a meeting with a plan about how to organize each discussion.

8. Do not let minority or dissenting opinions be ignored. Before closing a discussion it is vital to make sure that everyone is ready to move on.

9. Do not let people direct respond to a speaker, unless agreed to by the speaker or requested by the facilitator.

10. Write down the major points that people are making. Periodic summary of what has been said, what the goals of the discussion are, and how much time is left helps keep the group on track and cuts down on repetition.

11. Bring the discussion to a concrete end, allowing the group a sense of closure and accomplishment.

12. Though the discussion is being conducted by the facilitator, the will of the group as a whole is the guiding force in the process. The facilitator will often ask for general feelings, indicated by a thumbs up, down, or indifferent horizontal as a way to gauge how best to shape the discussion or meeting. This is an important mechanism that quickly and effectively makes sure that the overall will of the group is being followed.

Section 5. Participation

A. The other side of the coin is good participation and "self-facilitation." This is equally as important to a successful meeting.

B. Good participants:

    1. Listen. It is not as obvious as one may think.

    2. Ask questions if they have them.

    3. Self-facilitate. Don't repeat arguments that have already been stated in discussion or in the proposal itself. Part of professionalism is being polite.

    4. Take notes before they speak, which helps prevent them from rambling.

    5. Respect the stack.

        a. A direct response is used when a person not speaking has factual information to provide to the person speaking. Direct responses are only appropriate if they clarify some factual aspect of the issue, not for furthering an opinion (e.g. "I think the forum is on Thursday, but I'd like a direct response from someone who really knows").

        b. Jumping stack (speaking out of turn) is to be abhorred.

    6. Speak concisely and precisely.

    7. Don't use references only a few people will understand. If they are bringing up an obscure point, ask if anyone needs an explanation.

    8. Don't take things personally. Don't mistake criticism of an idea for an attack on one's character. Respect others' opinions. Opposition is inevitable.

FS UPBC Report

3/3/2022

UPBC met February 11ᵗʰ due to a snow cancellation on Feb 4ᵗʰ

Chancellor announced that Shrikant Jategaokar was appointed in the UPBC chair- elect role and will assume chair responsibilities in January 2023. He will work closely with Ann to transition into the role.

Governor's budget recommendations included a 5% retroactive increase for this fiscal year and a 5% increase for next fiscal year.

Cost increases were submitted to the BOT at the meeting 3/2/2022

CHAPA

The CHAPA Ad Hoc work group composed of student, staff and faculty representation has completed their work and provided a recommendation to UPBC and CHAPA (full committee):

- Purpose of CHAPA is to complete formative evaluations of higher administrative personnel (Chancellors and Vice Chancellors) offered in the spirit of quality improvement through a transparent process and accountable for reporting to all SIUE recognized constituencies
- The R/P committee reached consensus that they support CHAPA performing the Provost/Chancellor evaluations. FS R/P will be participate through their representation on CHAPA.
- A full CHAPA (360) review will occur within the first 4 years of hire; then at least every 6 years. Interim reviews will be performed at least every 3 years, with at least one prior to the first 360 review.
- Chancellor/Provost and VC's provide an annual progress report to constituencies during years when not under review, focusing on updates from most recent 360 or interim reviews. Reports to be shared with all constituencies.

Next Steps: The full CHAPA committee has resumed work to revise and update Policy 2B2 CHAPA to define process and revise/propose the Interim review instrument with the goal of final approval by June 1 to implement in Fall 2022.

Next meeting is March 4 with Chancellor Minor

IBHE-FAC report for the SIUE Faculty Senate meeting on 3 February 2022

The IBHE-FAC has met twice since the last Senate meeting in December 2021.

The IBHE-FAC met on 17 December 2021 via Zoom, with virtual hosting by the University of Saint Francis.

FAC Chair Shawn Schumacher shared two links from the December IBHE meeting: a study on the economic impact of community colleges, which was presented by Brian Durham, http://www2.iccb.org/data/illinois-community-colleges-economic-impacts/, and a video about the Common App, https://youtu.be/cQYQmyHr6uU. *FAC Secretary Melette Pearce* will be sending out links to the Canvas course that will be tested for IBHE-FAC working spaces.

Gretchen Lohman, IBHE Liaison, shared the upcoming dates for IBHE meetings: Jan 10, Mar 15, Jun 29, Aug 16, and Nov 15. The Early Childhood Consortium for Equity is continuing its work; details are at ecace.org and under "Work Under Way" area of the IBHE website (www.ibhe.org). The ECACE scholarship launched in November (https://www.isac.org/students/during-college/types-of-financial-aid/scholarships/ecace.html). A pilot for the Transfer Boost Project, consisting of eight institutions (one of which is SIUC) is developing a program with affordability guarantees for particular pathways.

Jen Delaney, IBHE member, explained that the presentation providing a six-month update on the Strategic Plan to the IBHE is available via the IBHE website. There was some discussion about private companies that are providing curriculum design resources, potentially reducing faculty input and reducing transparency and oversight.

University of Saint Francis guests – Dr. Beth Roth, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs; Jennifer Ethridge, Registrar; and Dr. Rob Manzer, Chief Academic Officer at Acadeum – presented regarding "Course Sharing Partnerships that Enhance Student Progression and Completion". University of Saint Francis is one of 21 independent colleges in Illinois that are part of a consortium supported by Acadeum to share spaces in online courses. Universities in the consortium can share information (e.g. course descriptions, faculty qualifications, expectations) for online courses that may have seats available and members can choose whether to list those courses as options for their own students. For students, such courses are automatically accepted and transcripted as a home institution course. Students pay their home institution tuition, the hosting institution receives a fee paid by the home institution less a management charge from Acadeum. This can be a benefit to all parties, whether to the student who stays on track or has more options, the host institution that doesn't have to cancel a small enrollment course, the home institution that can offer variety or flexibility with potentially reduced quality concerns, etc. This is still a developing area of academic coordination. There was lively discussion including issues of faculty versus administrative oversight and impacts on other components of the higher education system such as community colleges, articulation, and student debt.

The FAC approved the Open Letter on the Mental Health Action on Campus Act, brought forward by the IBHE FAC Student Mental Health Working Group. Circulation of the letter awaits addition of the official logo and notification of the IBHE.

Caucuses and working groups met, then reported out.
Selected caucus notes:
- Two-years: Discussed institutional COVID plans for spring, which have a lot of variation, as well as some issues associated with lab materials and associated costs.
- Private and Independent: Modalities range from completely in person to fully remote. Behavioral norms may need to be established each semester as incoming students' socialization patterns are more varied.
- Publics: Most institutions are planning to be as face-to-face as possible but some may have more testing information. Uncertainties about the long-term effects of Omicron remain. The group also discussed student evaluations of teaching – what is asked, how much it varies intra- and inter- institution, how they are used in faculty evaluations, etc. – and will be collecting more information regarding practices.

Selected working group notes:
- Student Debt and Affordability: Discussed what data is needed to support the group's assertions and how that data can be obtained. They may narrow their scope to focus on key topics that contribute to increased tuition rates. Discussion also includes state funding, taxation, and the value of institutions to the communities they serve.
- Institutional Closures: Unsure what role this group can play for this topic.
- Equity and Diversity: Hoping to have a rough draft of their position paper by January and make sure to connect to the IBHE Strategic Plan; could also produce additional documents targeting particular audiences.
- Performance Based Funding: Considering widening their scope to look at general funding formulas as well as performance-based aspects.
- Student and Faculty Mental Health: Discussed how to distribute the letter now that it has been approved. The group is developing a survey that will be distributed through Canvas to gather information from FAC members about campus environments for faculty regarding mental health issues.
- Dual Credit/Remote and Online Learning: Had a wide-ranging discussion about the pros and cons of approaches such as that discussed in the presentation about Acadeum from the University of Saint Francis, including faculty work load, branding and oversight, and the financial aspects.

The IBHE-FAC met on 21 January 2022 via Zoom.

FAC Chair Shawn Schumacher attended the January IBHE meeting. He shared a few updates – we are aiming for Feb 15 as the date to start circulating the Mental health letter approved last month; a couple of discussions have been started in Canvas; he is seeking suggestions for guest speakers for later meetings; whether the FAC will be in-person at all this year is in question, esp. given the varying institutional requirements.

Jaimee Ray, IBHE Legislative Liaison, shared that the current session is having a slow start, which is a bit unusual for a shared session. This season may be light because this is an election year where people are working new districts. IBHE has been working on an omnibus bill amending a lot of acts, all items based on the strategic plan or issues found during the planning process; currently the bill is 50 pages so she is working on a one-page summary.

Jen Delaney, IBHE member, discussed the January meeting – they don't want to wait until after the elections to make progress. The January meeting was focused on many budget issues – MAP, higher ed funding, equity adjustments, retirement, spending federal stimulus funds. In response to a question about the education companies from the previous meeting, she shared The Century Foundation report on OPMs: https://tcf.org/content/about-tcf/tcf-analysis-70-university-opm-contracts-reveals-increasing-risks-students-public-education/.

Gretchen Lohman, IBHE Liaison, shared updates about the consortium (ECACE), which has its next meeting on January 25th. Over 300 students have applied for the scholarship, and institutions are asking about institutional grants, although discussions regarding those are taking longer than expected. Details of budget information from the Board meeting can be found at https://www.ibhe.org/board/2022/January/Item_D-1_approved.pdf.

IBHE Executive Director Ginger Ostro and Ja'Neane Minor (IBHE Chief of Staff) met with the IBHE. Ja'Neane started in the fall at IBHE, coming from a background focused on equity issues at the K-12 level and now transitioning to higher education issues. Ginger started with an overview of the budget request (see the previous link shared by Gretchen for much of the information). IBHE is requesting a budget for higher education that would be an overall 7% increase, with 5% specifically for institutions but with some equity-based adjustments probably based partially on Pell funding. This means that institutions would see increases ranging from 4% (U of I system, SIU system) to 12% (Governors State). Other increases are requested for programs such as College Illinois (commitments to families saving for college), Diversifying Faculty in Illinois program, and MAP funding for students.

Several topics came up during discussion that focused on the relationships among community colleges, four-year institutions, high schools, and other education providers. For example, ECACE is focused on building consortia that address adults where they are to provide access to up-skilling, even for someone who is place-bound, but without relying solely on online options; this could be a model to learn from moving forward, but we are still in early stages of working out many of the issues. When looking at issues on the horizon for a while, the big issue is equity, since it will take everybody to improve success for people of color; related issues such as equitable access to dual credit and recruiting and retaining faculty and staff are also still in discussion and development.

Caucuses and working groups met, then reported out.
Selected caucus notes:
- Two-years: Discussed effects of COVID, positive (e.g. funding for a learning center) and negative (grief counseling). Faculty do have a voice in discussions.
- Private and Independent: Most institutions were planning to be as face-to-face but are online, but some are face-to-face and doing fine. There are some issues with top-down decision making, isolation, and the positives and negatives of online instruction. Also discussed SETS and the known problems of lower ratings for some groups and modalities.
- Publics: Talked about COVID, including impacts on research (discipline and needs dependent, e.g. lab access versus travel versus specialty populations or resources), variations in semester beginnings, and whether the state benchmarks for mitigation are being used or whether vaccination changed the implementation. We may not know the impacts of the various lockdown situations for a long time.

Selected working group notes:
- Institutional Closures: Although there are issues in this area, especially for students, this group may not have a good route to address them.
- Student Debt and Affordability: Worked in Canvas posting resources and information located so far. Next step is to lok into what Illinois is actually doing and then assemble a document with findings and any suggestions the group has.
- Equity and Diversity: Reviewed a robust draft document related to faculty recruitment and retention; this will get integrated with their larger document.
- Performance Based Funding: Contacted Gretchen about current practices.There is a formula but it is not being fully used. An important issue is to set goals in context for institutions, rather than trying to have uniform goals for all.
- Dual Credit/Remote and Online Learning: discussed focusing energies on key issues, such as academic quality, academic freedom, and academic credentialing, all of which cut across the two topics.
- Student and Faculty Mental Health: Assembled draft of survey questions for review by the full group (not everyone able to be present).

The next IBHE-FAC meeting will be February 18th, via Zoom.

With regards, Susan D. Wiediger, representative for SIUE to the IBHE-FAC. For more information about any of these items, please contact me via email at swiedig@siue.edu.

IBHE-FAC report for the SIUE Faculty Senate meeting on 3 March 2022

The IBHE-FAC has met three times since the last Senate meeting in December 2021. Please see the report for the cancelled February meeting (IBHE-FAC_Feb2022_FacultySenateReport.pdf) for the reports of the December and January meetings.

The IBHE-FAC met on 18 February 2022 via Zoom, with virtual hosting by Governor's State University.

FAC Chair Shawn Schumacher announced that the IBHE liaison to the FAC, Gretchen Lohman, is leaving the IBHE for a position in the University of Illinois System Office.

Jen Delaney, IBHE member, provided a brief update. The Governor's proposed budget included almost all IBHE recommendations with regards to higher education funding, with two notable exceptions where he included additional funding: increasing MAP funding to 122 million and including 230 million to honor all the contracts in the pre-paid tuition plan program. The Funding Commission (https://www.ibhe.org/Commission-on-Equitable-Public-University-Funding.html) met in February; the current formula being proposed is very focused on the undergraduate role and focuses on adequacy, which is common in K-12 but is not as good of a fit with all the roles that are filled by higher education. There are a couple of bills relevant to higher education in progress, such as re-vising the Mental Health bill and some related to children's savings accounts.

Governors State University guests addressed the FAC.
Dr. Cheryl Green, President, reviewed some of the outstanding initiatives and events associated with Governors State recently, such as their new Social Justice initiative, Chicago's Southland International Film Festival; a project capturing veteran oral histories; the Jaguar Leap summer immersion program; on-campus COVID testing using the SHIELD test that has recently been opened to the community; partnerships with local school districts to provide tutoring; and "the NATE" outdoor sculpture park. Funding priorities are handled through a budget advisory countil and units set their own budgets, although the president does try to provide additional support to programs that are growing, in accreditation, support the workforce initiatives in the area, or solve community problems.
Jessica Specht, Director of GSU Dual Degree Program (DDP), presented information about their successful partnerships with community colleges to support students earning an associates and then completing their bachelors degree at GSU. Features include sharing student data; high-touch advising (GSU advisors embedded at the CCs, semester check-in, DDP study plan, support for admission processes); immersive programming (cording ceremonies, induction, career/scholarship symposiums, community service opportunities); and financial incentives (tuition lock-in, application fee waiver, scholarships). The program is very female heavy (80:20). Enrollment in DDP dropped by about half during the pandemic, but they are rebounding, particularly with getting a secure electronic way to handle student data. Over 86% of DDP participants have graduated or are on-track for graduation; average GPA at graduation is 3.60; 60% of DDP students at GSU graduate in four semesters or less.

FAC Chair Shawn Schumacher discussed upcoming possible speakers at FAC meetings and reviewed issues to be discussed in caucuses. *Mike Phillips, FAC Legislative Liaison,* discussed several bills in varying stages of the legislative process. Those he thought might be of particular interest:

- HB 4361 – establishes minimum salary for instructors of not less than $1,333.33 per credit hour.
- HB 5315 – requires notification of part-time or non-tenure track faculty member about the status of enrollment of the class the faculty member was hired to teach at least 30 days before the beginning of a term and again at 14 days

before the beginning of the term. Also requires free or reimbursed parking for that academic term for such faculty members.

- HB 5361 – Creates Paraprofessional Fast Tract to Teaching Degree Pilot Program to create a 2-year degree pathway by which paraprofessional educators may enroll to achieve the education requirements to attain a professional education license, in compliance with ISBE and IBHE standards.
- HB 5428 – Creates Student Freedom of Speech Act: if a public institution of higher education in the State denies the freedom of speech of one of its students in contravention of the findings set forth in the Act, the student shall have a cause of action against that institution.
- HB 5464 – IBHE omnibus. Includes provisions concerning the implementation of equity plans and practices in regard to the underrepresentation of certain groups in higher education; and sets forth certain requirements that must be included in an equity plan.
- HB 5506 – amends Dual Credit Quality Act to extend professional development plans and to allow high school students to enroll in dual credit course for high school credit only.
- SB 3674 – amends the Public University Uniform Admission Pilot Program Act
- SB 3677 – Amends the Higher Education Student Assistance Act with regards to the Growing Regional Opportunities for Work (GROW) Illinois Grant Pilot Program.
- SB 3823/HB 5473 – Creates the Second Chance Seat in Every Class Act to reserve seats for incarcerated or previously incarcerated individuals.
- SB 3856 – requires provision of all necessary course materials for rental free of charge to students who meet specific qualifications (graduate of Illinois HS, current Illinois resident, no prior degree, and enrolled).

Caucuses and working groups met, then reported out.
Selected caucus notes:
- Publics: Discussed how student evaluations of teaching are used in faculty evaluation.
- Two-years: Discussed rotations and dual credit issues.
- Private and Independent: Discussed current Covid-19 issues, rotations, and dual credit.

Selected working group notes:
- Student Debt and Affordability: Narrowing down to states with models most relevant to Illinois.
- Equity and Diversity: Rough draft is six pages long, so will adapt to have two shorter versions for different audiences.
- Student and Faculty Mental Health: Reviewed survey questions to pilot later this spring.
- Performance Based Funding: Preparing paper; executive summary with longer paper with all the data.
- Dual Credit/Remote and Online Learning: Thinking about how early college can foster inequity as well as equity, and who is responsible for naming, studying, and responding to problems. When thinking about instructional modalities, there are disciplinary and institutional perspectives; need to consider time and opportunity costs as well as monetary, and impacts on mental health, physical health, and work/life balance.
- High Impact Practices in Higher Education (formerly Institutional Closures): Building on a recent document on return on investment for higher education, and starting with gathering some information about integrated or interdisciplinary studies programs.

<u>The next IBHE-FAC meeting will be March 18th, via Zoom.</u>

With regards, Susan D. Wiediger, representative for SIUE to the IBHE-FAC. For more information about any of these items, please contact me via email at swiedig@siue.edu.