The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 2:30pm on Thursday, February 6, 2020 in the Mississippi/Illinois Room by President DeGroot Brown.


Absent: Robert Bitter, Richard Flight, Laura Fowler, Andy Lozowski, Jennifer Miller, Vince Rapini, Brad Reed, Jeffrey Sabby, Dan Segrist, Walter Siganga, Bin Zhou

Excused: Tom Foster, Lisa Green,

Guest: Elza Ibroscheva, Rob Patino, Randy Pembrook

Announcements:
Announcements were reviewed as listed on the agenda. SIU System President Dan Mahony may be present at the February 13 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) meeting, and he will be on the SIUE campus for a meeting with constituency heads on March 5.

Consideration of Minutes:
The minutes for the December 5, 2019 meeting were approved as written.

Action Items:
The Welfare Council discussed redefining the responsibilities of the Council and proposed changes to the role of the Council. They would concentrate on two broad areas: issues for health-related faculty who are not represented under the Faculty Association contract and equity in the SIU system. The current grievance procedure is a very slow and time-consuming process, and the Welfare Council has been working with faculty in those areas under the leadership of Dan Segrist to develop a substitute policy tailored to their situation. The second focus would allow the Faculty Senate as a recognized constituency group to advocate for equity in the SIU system. The Council proposes a change to the Welfare Council Operating Papers. It would also require a slight change to the Rules and Procedures
Operating Papers and the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate to correct language about outside bodies; these changes would not alter the current role of the Rules and Procedures Council.

The floor was opened to questions. Part of the larger conversation of the FSEC is the overall direction of the Faculty Senate, however the Senate would approve any changes. Those not represented by the Faculty Association were not specified in the change in order to be inclusive, and it was noted that the contract defines those faculty.

There was a motion and second to suspend the rules and approve the changes without a second reading, and it passed unanimously. Wrobbel stated that the argument supporting the suspension of rules is because of a circumstance out of the control of the Faculty Senate one Council was rendered without function.

There was a motion and a second to approve the changes to the Welfare Council Operating Papers, the Rules and Procedures Council Operating Papers, and the Faculty Senate Bylaws. There was discussion about the Faculty Association contract removing 90% of the Welfare Council’s jurisdiction leaving them with little to do. The question was called, however there was no second and discussion continued. The changes to the Rules and Procedures Operating Papers are needed because editorially it creates a conflict. It was noted that Welfare Council has representation from the affected Schools, and the language changes make it clear that only faculty not represented by the contract are covered by the grievance portion.

The question was called and seconded and was approved unanimously. There was a motion and second to ask the FSEC supply to the Faculty Senate all the necessary changes to the Bylaws, Operating Papers of Welfare Council, and Operating Papers of Rules and Procedures and the exact new version. It was adopted unanimously.

**Guest:**
Rob Patino, Director of the Office of Technology Transfer for the SIU System, was a guest at the meeting to speak about ResearchEnabled (researchenabled.org). The system received a grant to build a portal to allow our faculty to be advisers to industrial partners. As the project evolved, they realized that the tool could do more throughout the system and with other universities. It is modeled after the Penn State gateway portal, but it is not just a STEM focus and includes humanities, human resources, and other areas.

E-mails were sent to faculty encouraging them to claim their profile, and reminders will be sent until it is done. The portal does not have the ability to pre-populate information so it has to be filled in manually. He noted that the basic information and research interests were the important sections to complete. Faculty do not have to participate in collaboration requests. Articles and biographies are only shared with research staff and not the industry partners.
The portal is in quality control for industry review, and it is expected to be completed mid-February with soft rollouts in March. It will be launched to bigger partners later in the year once bugs are worked out. The Illinois Innovation Network has pushed to bring all public universities together, and the Provost has been working with that.

Chancellor Randy Pembrook was also a guest at the meeting and shared information that was discussed at the Q&A prior to the Faculty Senate meeting. The Governor visited SIUE to announce $10.5 million for the Health Science building with another $90 million later to finish the project. A multi-purpose room previously used primarily for arts was renovated at the East St. Louis Center with donations, and it is now also a gymnasium and available for concerts. The Black Faculty and Staff Association gave a State of the Black Union address today, and he stated that he hopes it will become an annual event. The Faculty and Staff Appreciation day was moved to 2-6pm and will include food and massage chairs as in previous years. 20 proposals came forward in the Innovation Grant process. The Quality Initiative survey put recruitment and retention near the top, and Elza Ibrocheva will be reaching out in various ways for more information. The R2 conversation will likely stretch into April or May; it is an important decision for the University, and he stated that would rather have it right than fast.

SIU System President Dan Mahony starts on March 1, and he will be on the SIUE campus March 4-5. He has created working groups with a chair from each campus to look at enrollment, retention, strategic planning, system efficiencies, and community outreach. He also requested reading materials developed over the past few years so that he could get up to speed. Mahony will be meeting with constituency heads, and Pembrook gave him a briefing on what is going on with SIUE including allocation concerns.

The next Board of Trustees meeting is February 12-13 on the Edwardsville campus, and there are public comments sections for those who wish to make remarks. Mahony will not be present, however he may phone in to the meeting. Tuition and fees will be discussed. SIUE has been working on a tuition fee proposal since August, however the Governor is suggesting a zero increase. The Trustees feel that it would be best for the system to come in with no increase and have funding come from the state.

There are several proposals in Springfield. The Summer Bridge Program helps students to get started, and SIUE funded it at an effort of about $50,000-$100,000. Springfield has realized that the bridge programs help students come to school and retain, and are talking about $20 million from the state to support these kinds of initiatives. The legislature passed a bill to require a ratio between the number of students and available counselors, but it was an unfunded mandate. This spring they are talking about a funding mechanism and are discussing the topic with our counselors.

The floor was opened to questions.

There was a discussion about the state funding for higher education, and the Governor has talked about a 6% increase; the increase was 5% last year. With the system splitting new money 50/50, it would be about $7-8 million for SIUE. Student fees were discussed, and money from the fees can only go for specific purposes. The general fund is more flexible, and SIUE can do what would have been done with
an increase in tuition and fees within the budget that was created. There was a discussion about fees vs. tuition as well as Textbook Services. Support for graduate programs was also discussed including increased scholarship support and Teaching Assistant stipends.

Pembrook gave an overview of the results of a consultant hired to do a study of SIUE’s tuition structure. The consultant talked to potential students and the parents of potential students and presented various scenarios on increases. Any increase between 0-8% had no impact on whether a student would attend or not, meaning there would be no negative effect. The consultant reported that people are confused by the fact that SIUE is a really good school but the price point is the lowest in the state. The study also looked at whether it was better to have a higher tuition and offer scholarships or to keep the fee and tuition as currently setup.

Assistant Provost Elza Ibroscheva spoke about the Quality Initiative proposal that will be submitted in June 2020 as part of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) requirements. The proposal is currently in the planning and conceptualizing stage. A survey was sent out in December to faculty, staff, and students to see what the community finds most important. Those results are included in a part of the Provost website dedicated to the Quality Initiative. Listening sessions and focus groups have started working. A formal call for proposals will be sent out, and there will be institutional support for resources needed. The HLC notes that the initiative does not have to be a success, but they do want to see what the institution has learned from the project.

Unfinished Business:
The results of the Service Survey was posted in SharePoint and is attached. Results were also shared with the Provost. Feedback and thoughts should be submitted to President DeGroot Brown.

New Business:
Duff Wrobbel was presented as a candidate for President-Elect. He is currently the Chair of the Graduate Council and was previously Faculty Senate President in 2008. The floor was opened for nominations. There was a motion and second to close nominations with Wrobbel as the only candidate, and it was adopted unanimously.

Reports from Standing Committees:
The University Planning and Budget Committee (UPBC) discussed tuition and fees. Their next meeting is in April

The IBHE report was posted to SharePoint and is attached.

Reports from Council Chairs:
The Faculty Development Council reported that an open house was held for the Center for Faculty Development and Innovation. Excellence in Undergraduate Education (EUE) proposal outlines are due by the end of February.
The Curriculum Council report was posted to SharePoint and is attached.

Rules and Procedures reported that the evaluation of the Chancellor is in progress. The response rate in the past has been very low, and everyone is encouraged to take part. CHAPA will be using this data as part of their review. The Provost evaluation will begin mid-February. Election notices for Senators will be going out. A written report was posted to SharePoint and is attached.

The Welfare Council shared that the subcommittee from health-related schools will be presenting updated grievance procedures in March.

The Graduate Council reported that the Educational and Research Policies (ERP) Committee has been working on a new policy to allow NTT faculty with appropriate terminal degrees to have temporary graduate faculty status through the term of their contracts. The Carnegie Committee has been put together and meeting; they have asked for an extension of the April deadline in order to do more thorough research.

The Past President reported on the Meridian Scholar selection committee, which will be conducting interviews with students on February 14. 160 students were selected to visit campus. He also attended the Faculty and Staff Appreciation Day meeting and the UPBC meeting.

The President-Elect had no report.

The President posted a report to SharePoint and is attached.

**Public Comment:**
There was no public comment.

**Adjournment:**
The meeting adjourned at 4:25pm.

Submitted by Anne Hunter, University Governance
FACULTY SENATE MEETING - AGENDA
Mississippi/Illinois Room, Morris University Center
February 6, 2020 – 2:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. GUESTS
   a. Rob Patino, Director Office of Technology Transfer (3:00pm)
   b. Chancellor Randy Pembroke (3:30pm)
   c. Eliza Ibroscheva, Associate Provost (4:00pm)

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Upcoming Guest Speakers to Faculty Senate
      i. March 5 – Provost Cobb and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Jeffrey Waple
      ii. May 7 (Tim Hall, Athletics Director)
   b. Upcoming Guest Speakers to FSEC
      i. February 13 – Provost Cobb and Assistant Provost Jessica Harris (to discuss
         Essential Skills and Abilities Statements for academic programs); Tom Jordan (to
         discuss dual career academic couples)
      ii. April 23 – Provost Cobb
   c. Board of Trustees Meeting February 12-13 at SIUE

IV. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
   a. December 5, 2019

V. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Revising the role of Welfare Council

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   a. University Service Survey

VII. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Presentation of Faculty Senate presidential candidate(s)

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
   a. UPBC – Nancy Lutz
   b. IBHE Faculty Advisory Council – Susan Wiediger

IX. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL CHAIRS
   a. Faculty Development Council – Marie Klopfenstein
   b. Curriculum Council – Faith Liebl
   c. Rules & Procedures Council – Wai Cheah
   d. Welfare Council – Stephen Kerber
   e. Graduate Council – Duff Wrobbel
   f. Past-President – Sorin Nastasia
   g. President-Elect – Laurie Rice
   h. President – Jocelyn DeGroot

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Thursday, March 5, 2020, at 2:30 PM in the Mississippi/Illinois Room, MUC
Current Definition of Role

Welfare Council

The Welfare 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 grievances.

Proposed Redefinition of Role

Welfare and Governance Council

The Welfare and Governance Council is responsible for 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 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 grievances.
2019-2020 Faculty Perceptions of University Service

This investigation of faculty perceptions of university-level service was an extension of some challenges identified at the All Faculty Meeting on October 31, 2019. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) designed a process to explore this particular challenge. A survey was sent to SIUE’s Announce listserve twice, with responses submitted over a period of 8 days. Participants were asked 5 open-ended questions, 2 Likert-scale questions, 2 number entry questions, and one demographic question. The ratings and open-ended questions focused on the participant’s willingness to participate in university service, perception of unit support of university service, challenges in engaging in university service, and suggestions for increasing faculty involvement. Although we focused primarily on faculty input, the survey was available for all SIUE employees. Results and recommendations follow.

Demographics
117 people completed some part of the questionnaire (participants were not required to complete all questions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position at SIUE</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Other category included instructor, support staff, part-time lecturers, and civil service employees.*

Willingness to Participate in Service and Support for Service
Using a 0-4 Likert scale, with 0 being “not at all” and 4 being “a lot,” participants responded to the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree are you willing to participate in university service?</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does your unit support service at the university level?</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willing to Participate</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Support</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers are promising. Most people are willing to participate, and the perception of unit support is positive.
**Low Willingness to Participate**

People who ranked their willingness to participate as 0, 1, or 2 were categorized as Low Willingness to Participate. Qualitative comments explaining their rankings overwhelmingly indicated a lack of time to participate at the university level. Similar comments were made in response to identifying barriers to participation in university level service. Specifically, people are spending the majority of their time serving at the department level, as this tends to result in more tangible outcomes. This lack of outcomes at the university level was a secondary theme leading to reduced interest in university level service. The lack of meaningful results from university level committees was clearly identified as a reason for low degrees of willingness to serve. Representative comments include:

there is already significant service required in my department and that combined with the teaching and scholarship expectations, means there is only so much time in the day!

It is difficult to find the desire to be involved when I am so poorly compensated for the work I do. As an undervalued employee, I have a difficult time going out of my way to make time for committees that seemingly have no pull and were seemingly created to "look good" for the university.

Service should be value added. Unfortunately, a fair amount of university service is perfunctory and "process oriented" - just checking boxes. Not a lot of value add in too much of what is considered "service." Personally, more value comes from efforts focused on our unit as well as to the profession.

For 22 years I have contributed to the nth degree which has negatively impact my research productivity. Now, when attempting to be promoted to full professor, your service is actually irrelevant. I am not taking one for the team anymore, when other faculty need to step up.

I don't think I can completely avoid [service] and be promoted, but it is a huge drain on time with no tangible result. Therefore, I am willing to participate in university level service in order to "check a box" but I want to minimize the time I spend on it.

**High Willingness to Participate**

People who ranked their willingness to participate 3 or 4 were categorized as High Willingness to Participate. Most of the respective qualitative responses reference the participants’ desire to keep improving SIUE. Others simply enjoy participating on university level committees and find value in them. Representative comments include:

I care about SIUE and want to see it be better. I'm therefore willing to do the necessary work.

I feel like University service is an important part of being a faculty member. I don't have any beefs with the SIUE admins, but I'm a big believer in shared governance. I want a say in what goes on.
There are two University-wide student-centered issues that matter a lot to me. I accept every single service opportunity related to either of them.

I like some university service when I like the people I'm working with, and feel the objective of the task aligns with my own objectives.

I think service is important and without all participating, the university suffers.

**Low Unit Support**

People who ranked their unit's support for university service as 0, 1, or 2 were categorized as Low Unit Support. Reasons given for low support included junior faculty being “protected” from the time requirements of university level service and being “told to do less.” The unit was also sometimes identified as being too understaffed with their own high need for service at the department level. Finally, the unit’s operating papers prioritize department service over university service, so it was more important to spend time in that capacity. Comments from those with low unit support read:

We are also very service heavy as an accredited program and we don't have as many faculty. The unit does support Unv service and thinks it's important but we protect junior faculty from it (and most faculty in the dept are Junior faculty) and we encourage folks to take on light Unv service.

Our papers give priority to program and department level service. It does not discourage university level. The idea is that one way to best serve the university is to ensure the program is high quality.

Our unit is too understaffed for faculty to be able to effectively participate in university service.

**High Unit Support**

People who ranked their unit’s support for university service as 3 or 4 were categorized as High Unit Support. These participants described their unit as having a supportive chair and/or dean. Others’ operating papers put a large emphasis on university service. Explanations included:

My department tries to fit each faculty member's service load with what is appropriate for their rank and interests. Junior faculty start with a light load that gradually escalates. Associate-rank faculty are expected to work toward substantial service accomplishments in order to get promoted to full professor. "Substantial" means leadership experience at the departmental, unit, and university levels.

We encourage faculty to participate in meaningful service as appropriate for where they are in their career and personal interests. We protect junior faculty and expect senior faculty to carry a much greater load to do this.

it's viewed as important exposure for the department
Perceived and Desired Service Load
Participants were then asked to consider percentages of actual time spent and preference of time spent on university service. They entered that data in response to the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What percentage of your time do you spend on service?</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of your time would you prefer to spend on service?</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>162.24</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of Percentage Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Time Spent</th>
<th>Preferred Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A huge variance existed in this data, so the difference in the actual and preferred time spent on service for each participant was determined.

Perceived Service Load vs Desired Service Load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference in % Range</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-30 to -10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Underserving: Would like to engage in more service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-9 to 5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Desired amount of service attained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Somewhat overserving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excessive service: Would like to reduce their service load considerably</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most people in the Excessive Service category identified that their actual time spent in university service was in the 50% or above range. This is reified in the qualitative comments that articulated the need for more equal distribution of responsibilities. One person explained, “there needs to be a way to ensure that [service] doesn't continually fall on the same people over and over.” The term “burned out” was used repeatedly by numerous participants throughout the responses.

Preferred Service Activities
In addition to participating in meaningful ways to benefit students, people preferred engaging in service that is directly related to their department, their research, or their expertise. This means
that each person has different preferences across the board. However, the participants did agree that they wanted to participate in service activities that are efficient and useful. They want meetings that are organized, have a specific end date, and result in useful outcomes (not just “rubber stamping”). For example, people want to participate in:

- Things that have a chance to be implemented that aren't rubber stamps for the administration.
- higher impact Senate Committees: Curriculum, Rules and Procedures, or Welfare.
- Councils because you can influence change right away.
- things that have a concrete impact on students and faculty.

**Barriers of Service Participation**
Although many people want to participate in university level service, numerous obstacles exist that hinder their own participation. These reasons included heavy workload, lack of interest, and the perception that their efforts in university service would not matter.

**Other Workload/Time Commitments**
Department service was valued over university service, as they appeared to be more meaningful activities that had tangible outcomes for those participating in them. Others indicated that their teaching schedule (Tuesdays and Thursdays) would conflict with Faculty Senate meetings, so they felt as though they could not participate via that channel. Relevant comments include:

- Too few faculty and too few support staff means that we have way too much program-level work to do.
- I believe University service is important, but we no longer have grad assistants. It seems like the demands for training and paperwork keep increasing, so I have less time devote to service than we used to years ago.
- The number of classes we teach prevents me from being more engaged. By the time I teach, prep, grade, and try to squeeze in some research, there is barely any time left for service. Of the time that I have for service, departmental is the most valued so university level is an afterthought.
- I have a clinical practice site with specific time obligations. This limits my availability to be on campus for meetings.”
- It's hard to find University-level service that is not exceptionally time-intensive.

**Lack of Interest**
Some people are simply not interested in university level service. They would rather spend the majority of their time on research or teaching, earning the minimum ranking of satisfactory to earn their promotion.
No Significant Outcome
Perhaps the most troubling category that emerged throughout the survey responses was the underlying perception that university service does not matter – to the person, to the university, or to administrators. This assessment was attributed to the work not being impactful, not being valued, and not being useful. Essentially, comments reflecting this category indicated that people believe the decisions or recommendations made are disregarded and, therefore, inconsequential. Exemplar comments include:

Service isn't valued much for contracts/pay/promotion. It seems like a check box.
Faculty involvement begins with respect. Once the university respects its employees, by providing livable wages for the work given, getting rid of unqualified management and hiring effective leaders, and being open to new ideas, only then will employees feel the need to be more involved. At this point, there is a lot of frustration regarding the above items and it is difficult to find the desire to go above and beyond when your place of employment does the bare minimum for you as the individual.
Most of the work seems to have little tangible impact on the operation of the university (because much of what the various committees suggest is just wholesale ignored by administration) so why waste the time?
My interest and willingness are limited by other faculty who participate but seem to do so unwillingly or with little interest in thoughtful conversations about the curriculum; who simply think that university service is a 'rubber-stamp' on college or department decisions
Some committees have faculty representation but no ability to affect decision making. They are in many ways just rubber-stamping whatever moves through the committee (an example: UPBC).
What we do doesn't matter. Faculty input is just that, input. The work is busy work rather than anything substantive. The ultimate decision makers are administrators.
Many service opportunities seem to create busy work rather than provide an opportunity to make a real difference.
I do not feel as though there is a university "buy in" in terms of service and commitment. I work with a variety of employees in several different capacities and I have found that they are quite frustrated with the overall demeanor and morale of the campus. If administration would value and appreciate us, perhaps we (I) would feel the need to participate.
For many service opportunities, it's just busy work. For the policy related committees, it's all just recommendations and no actual teeth. So, why do it all if the admin can just say "no thanks" and make you (or someone else) start over again. That is pointless and frustrating. I stopped participating in any of that busy work as soon as I could.

Suggestions for Increasing Faculty Involvement
Most participants were able to pinpoint at least one suggestion for increasing involvement in university level service — many of which were tied to the previously mentioned barriers that impede service participation.
Membership
Some participants specifically discussed the membership of committees and groups. Relevant suggestions are paraphrased below:
- Include/encourage NTT involvement
- Limit university service to faculty past their midpoint
- Use term limits to encourage a steady rotation
- Require more men to participate
- Department chair should be knowledgeable as to who needs the service, and s/he should encourage those to participate
- Departments should be more selective in terms of who they want representing them in faculty senate (not simply sending the newest or most challenging people)
- Hire more faculty so we are not stretched so thin

One person summarized their experience with committee membership:

The biggest issue that I've seen is the high turnover rate in service roles and the bad faculty-service role matches that occur as a result. Oftentimes, the person selected to serve on a committee or chair is not the best person for the role. They were just the best person who had time to do it or gave in to the arm-twisting. A person in that situation might feel in over their head or lacking expertise or interest in the work. They end up doing the bare minimum or less.

Incentives
Other participants recommended providing incentives for service work. These incentives could be increased value for promotion and tenure, lunches, stipends, and power. For example:

- Teaching and research are more valued. Perhaps if service were more valued in terms of promotion and tenure
- Attach more weight to service in tenure and promotion decisions, particularly for associate professors seeking promotion to full, and encourage departments to keep faculty members in the same service roles long enough that they become comfortable in their roles and effective.
- Funding for FOOD, if it is a lunch time meeting.
- Allow the committee to actually make changes (give them agency)
- There is no formal or informal benefit to doing service. No release time, no compensation, not really even much appreciation.
- Parts of service, when the involvement of the individual becomes too time consuming, should be remunerated. The university administrators should at least consider this.
Examine Need for Committees
Many people doubted that all of the current committees at SIUE need to exist. They questioned the purpose of some committees and if the committees’ decisions led to actual outcomes. Specific comments include the following:

Streamline committees
Get rid of committees/work about which admins already made a decision
Take an inventory of University service and see what is truly required and what might be minimized or eliminated.

Additionally, some people indicated that the Faculty Association has “taken over” the role of faculty at the university level, so they do not feel compelled to engage in that level of service any longer.

Committee Procedures
Numerous people advocated for more transparency in terms of the committee objectives, procedures, impacts, and time requirements so they can make an informed decision about agreeing to engage in service or not. They recommended the following:

Provide more information about the work
Show the impact of the committee work (previous outcomes)
Give more specifics regarding time, meetings, subjects
Provide clear goals and the impact the committee will have
Be more efficient within committees
Allow for smaller amounts of service
Allow people to zoom in to meetings
Ensure that the same people are not doing all of the work continually
Highlight the skills learned and/or honed from "entry-level" to leading service opportunities (i.e., what's in it for them other than ticking a required box for T&P).

Arguments for Reducing Service
Participants provided a wealth of information about their experiences with and perceptions of service activities at SIUE. One theme that came up throughout the survey was that service needs at the university have increased for faculty, yet this increase is not necessarily beneficial for the students, departments, or university. This increased service load can cause unintended consequences. For example:

Service and Research do NOT go together. You have to sacrifice one to do more of the other. If you want research active faculty, you need to allow them to engage in less service.

There is no adjustment of expectations if one does a lot of service. That means that if you do a healthy amount of service, your teaching and scholarship suffer - as well as potential for merit raises and promotion. The impact of service on scheduling isn't taken into account, so class times run into or conflict with required meeting times for certain kinds of service. The result is that someone may be elected to serve, but may have to find
someone else to take it on. Or those who don't shirk service end up teaching classes back to back then going to meetings, without downtime or even time to eat.

Members of our small unit have served in major service responsibilities to the point of hindering department growth.

Service just seems to be this extra thing that some people do because they like to be involved or something. It is not viewed as part of the job. Maybe that is because if you have two faculty, one does lots of research and get papers published and one that does service and doesn't get as many papers published, guess which one gets more attention and kudos and automatic promotion/tenure? The one with the more papers. The one without so many papers gets told that they need to publish more papers and what have they been doing with themselves?

Faculty shouldn't let service take too much time away from teaching and scholarship.

A ridiculous amount of departmental and school service is required in 2019 compared to earlier expectations. This is partly due to external influences such as accreditation agencies, but internal expectations such as (just one example) the vast effort that is required for University assessment. Note that University assessment was essentially a non-issue until fairly recently. Now it requires a large amount of effort. Something has to give and Faculty Senate service and related committees are luxuries that can be ignored. Another huge drain on time are the number of recruitment-related activities at the School and Department level.

**Recommendations**

Although the underlying focus of the questionnaire focused on how to get faculty more involved with service at the University level, faculty responses revealed that the focus should instead be on how to make service experiences more meaningful and valuable to faculty. Advisory committees are not viewed favorably, as much time and other resources are depleted only to have the committee’s recommendation disregarded by administration. This indicates a lack of authentic shared governance. Further, the FSEC recommends increasing the perceived value of service. Dedicated support and awards for faculty service (much like SIUE has for research and teaching) would be one step toward this transformation.

Prepared and approved by
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
2/5/2020
Appendix
Raw Data Organized by Question

To what degree are you willing to participate in University service?

Low degree of willingness (0, 1, 2)

Explanations of ranking:

Already too busy with assigned teaching and active research work
My department is under an extreme amount of pressure and I have to concentrate on departmental service
It all depends on the time and work commitment. My department is already very service heavy so adding Univ service can be quite hard
Most, but not all, university service produces nothing of value to students or taxpayers. But we're stuck with policies and procedures that give us no choice but to operate inefficiently, so everyone needs to do "a bit", just to keep the university functioning.
I serve on 2 university committees
Teaching load, research and enormous departmental service does not leave room for taking on additional uncompensated work. Ultimately there is no merit in the system and I am exhausted.
My talents and preferences lie in teaching and research
I have served already extensively at the university level and now my service focus is at the program level - program director, which consumes most of my service time.
I don't feel established enough in terms of research program and to meet research expectations requires a substantial time commitment.
Department service expectations have expanded over the past 10 years and there is less time for University service.
I am very interested in University service. I have zero interest in FA service. It's a waste of everyone's time and moves us away, not towards, shared governance.
I am willing to be a good team play but unwilling to add bureaucratic layers (typically committees)
Too busy with other service.
There are not enough hours in each day to fulfill all of the service, teaching, and research needs that the job entails.
If I think something meaningful is going come from it. Most service seems designed to burn faculty time so that they won't have the energy to argue with the administration.
Am already overcommitted to service activities
I wish to serve where it matters. Sometimes you don't know until you are already on the committee. Sometimes, a lack of leadership makes it hard to stay interested. Sometimes a lack of leadership makes the committee continue when it is not necessary.
Although I believe very strongly in higher education and this institution, it is difficult to find the desire to be involved when I am so poorly compensated for the work I do. As an undervalued employee, I have a difficult time going out of my way to make time for committees that seemingly have no pull and were seemingly created to "look good" for the university.

I'm already very busy with my other responsibilities.

I have no interest in this

I have significant service within my department and outside of the University related to my field that already consumes a significant amount of my time.

I don't think I can completely avoid it and be promoted, but it is a huge drain on time with no tangible result. Therefore, I am willing to participate in university level service in order to "check a box" but I want to minimize the time I spend on it.

I don't regularly work on campus so it would be hard for me to get there, logistically.

I rather spend time on research.

I am the Chair of a Unit.

Service should be value added. Unfortunately, a fair amount of university service is perfunctory and "process oriented" - just checking boxes. Not a lot of value add in too much of what is considered "service." Personally, more value comes from efforts focused on our unit as well as to the profession.

I have been advised by multiple faculty that research is more important for TT assistant professors

I am an adjunct; I would love to be involved, but I do not have the time to work for free.

More impactful work with the FA and department

I am overworked and undercompensated, and the university has done nothing to demonstrate to me that it cares about faculty. I've been here nearly 20 years, and participated at very high levels in all types of university service. But I'm trying to figure out a way to get out.

For 22 years I have contributed to the nth degree which has negatively impact my research productivity. Now, when attempting to be promoted to full professor, your service is actually irrelevant. I am not taking one for the team anymore, when other faculty need to step up.

Other commitment

I can do some but I have a lot of other service responsibilities.

I did not choose 3 or 4 because I am already heavily involved in service both inside the university at Department level, and somewhat at University level, and outside of it. Indeed, most of my department is. There is a real issue with either too much service being required, or with people not getting a break from high service levels and burning out, or with some people doing very little service (I don't know if that is happening here, but it is a well-documented pattern in academia).

there is already significant service required in my department and that combined with the teaching and scholarship expectations, means there is only so much time in the day!
The volume of mandated university and college reports and assessment mechanisms on top of teaching and scholarship makes additional service extremely burdensome.

I try to make it count toward merit review. Right now, my department needs faculty to focus on program and department level service.

I used to do more but I have gotten burned out. Now I mainly focus on school service.

3. There is essential university service such as program review, CBA, and other stuff that won't get done without faculty help.

Often the participation is busy work and not true responsibility or decision making power.

University service is not rewarded in anyway. It is just extra work on top of everything else.

I am a part-time instructor with very little extra time to spare, but I could do some limited help. Most is either a waste of time/not important or too heavy a workload - no middle.

Perception that it involves endless work that can then be ignored by administration (e.g. family friendly policies)

I feel this would allow me to still work full time, go to school part-time, and still have some free time to myself.

Pretenure - expected for my service in operating papers

Already do service.

The department director discourages it.

If I find the topic important and productive, I am more likely to participate.

I want to spend more time on research. I have done a great deal of university service while my male colleagues are less involved. It does not advance my career to disproportionately perform "service" roles due to the ingrained expectations of my gender. Doing so comes at the expense of research and teaching goals.

**To what degree are you willing to participate in University service?**

*High degree of willingness (3, 4)*

*Explanations of ranking:*

I care about SIUE and want to see it be better. I'm therefore willing to do the necessary work.

University level service is often very interesting and allows me to interact with people from various areas of the university.

I am willing as I believe it is part of my citizenship in the Uni.

There are two University-wide student-centered issue that matter a lot to me. I accept every single service opportunity related to either of them.

As part of the 3 areas where I am evaluated (teaching, scholarship and service) this is an expectation of my role within the University. I am happy to participate in activities that fulfill that role.
It is essential for faculty to participate in the governance of the university; we have a responsibility to take an active role in building and guiding the university into its future. I have always been willing to participate, and I currently do.

I think this is where the most effective change can occur b/c this, for me, includes university-wide grant development, between-college curriculum advancement, and long-term planning for the future of the institution. If we're going to survive economic, demographic, and technological transformations in the field, it'll have to happen at the university level.

We need to be involved in the good workings of the university.

Always willing to help when possible.

I currently serve on University Committees. It is a forum in which to work with other faculty colleagues from across the University towards accomplishing meaningful tasks that benefit SIUE.

I serve on Faculty Senate, chair one university-level committee, serve on 2 other university-level committees, and serve in various small capacities for my department.

I feel like University service is an important part of being a faculty member. I don't have any beefs with the SIUE admins, but I'm a big believer in shared governance. I want a say in what goes on.

I am a willing participant in any activities that promote the business needs of the university!

I've always been actively involved in service at the U level... Senate, Grad Council, etc.

I already do it. Not many people in my unit volunteer for university service.

I enjoy working with other schools/faculty.

I try to do as much as possible to participate in service, though I sometimes struggle to find opportunities to participate.

I am very willing to participate in University service that makes a real difference, such as Union activities, which I regard as University service.

I believe all faculty, staff, and students ARE the university. We should all be very involved.

Service plays an important function.

I believe service is an opportunity to build and effectively carry out the vision and mission of the university.

My involvement in university service depends a lot on my schedule and the time requirement of the service. I am willing to participate if I can satisfy the responsibilities of the service.

When opportunities arise I do, but many require one to be elected.

Untenured

I am department chair right now, so have less time for university service.

To a large degree university runs on the service of faculty.

Do a fair bit, but not overly so. There comes a point to which university service no longer pays.
I consider it to be an important part of my professional conduct
I like some university service when I like the people I'm working with, and feel the objective of
the task aligns with my own objectives.
I was a member of faculty senate for two terms. I like the being able to stay current
i think it is important to have input in on university wide decisions
It's a necessary duty.
High teaching load (and indirect teaching) makes it difficult to do more than #3.
Some University service is interesting and useful, some is not. Sometimes I have too much to do
for it to make sense.
I am willing but not eagerly seeking new service.
it is always nice to meet people outside of your unit and know how others work.
I have quite a bit of departmental service, but have enjoyed my time spent at university level
service.
I think service is important and without all participating, the university suffers.
I feel that shared governance is an important component of higher education
Like to be more involved
Service is part of the job.
To what extent does your unit support service at the University level?

Low degree of support (0, 1, 2)

Explanations of ranking:

We are also very service heavy as an accredited program and we don't have as many faculty. The unit does support Univ service and thinks it's important but we protect junior faculty from it (and most faculty in the dept are Junior faculty) and we encourage folks to take on light Univ service it is required for P and T which is why I do it. Otherwise, there is not time with teaching and research responsibilities.

University service is expected, along with increasing expectations for department and school level service.

We have two faculty on CAS congress and a member of Senate, we have several faculty who have served on program reviews.

Small department, overworked, service is valued, but avoided because there's too much spread among too few.

It is encouraged at meetings and via email.

I am rarely given opportunities to participate in service. I have to find these opportunities from faculty members outside my unit.

it's not support it is "required" and often you are forced too

it is required for promotion but not rewarded

Faculty in especially small units have full plates of teaching, research and services.

Counts towards service. No release time or anything for University level service

We sometimes get told to do less service.

I know there are faculty in my school that are on different committees

No knowledge

I don't actually know.

I am under East St. Louis Head Start department. No chance to be involved.

There is no benefit whatsoever to University service, other than personal satisfaction.

I don't think my department supports or acknowledges NTT service

There is no adjustment of expectations if one does a lot of service. That means that if you do a healthy amount of service, your teaching and scholarship suffer - as well as potential for merit raises and promotion. The impact of service on scheduling isn't taken into account, so class times run into or conflict with required meeting times for certain kinds of service. The result is that someone may be elected to serve, but may have to find someone else to take it on. Or those who don't shirk service end up teaching classes back to back then going to meetings, without downtime or even time to eat.

Members of our small unit have served in major service responsibilities to the point of hindering department growth
My unit (not department, but above) does nothing but make my job harder by increasing course caps and creating oversight and bureaucracy that make my job harder.

With the exception of being forwarded emails requesting our time to volunteer, my department does not really push the idea of volunteering.

I need some university level service for promotion; other than that, my unit doesn’t care.

Not sure what you mean by “support” service.

I think there are not always opportunities to serve in the various capacities of service at the university level.

Our papers give priority to program and department level service. It does not discourage university level. The idea is that one way to best serve the university is to ensure the program is high quality.

It is encouraged, but no benefits at unit level for doing service.

Our unit is too understaffed for faculty to be able to effectively participate in university service.

**To what extent does your unit support service at the University level?**

*High degree of support (3, 4)*

*Explanations of ranking:*

My department supports everything I do.

There are talents in the Teaching and Learning Department that lend themselves to university service

Very supportive department

It is partially required for our merit reviews.

We have faculty involved in almost every major- and some minor- University service activities

I’ve been asked to serve on university committees by my unit’s administration.

My department is supportive and values this work appropriately.

No need to explain—my unit supports it.

They recognize the importance

They always want more...until it comes evaluation time. Then, people get dinged on research output.

there is not restriction on the type of service we choose

Our Operating papers put a fair amount of emphasis on it for T&P and annual review.

We all know we should do our part to help the university and it is good to have a voice at that level.

We rank it very highly in annual reviews.

I work for the SON and they wholeheartedly support service and scholarship.
Every effort is made to recognize service
We support it too much to the detriment of our department
Service clearly counts in our operating papers.
We support those who are interested and willing, and believe it to be important.
We have faculty participating in very high profile university service areas.
The unit does encourage it.
My Dean and Chair are very supportive.
It's included in department annual review and promotion criteria, but there are also many other service avenues
Our unit respects university service.
its up to the individual to decide
I think we support it. I mean, it counts, and in places where I've worked on large grants they've tried to enable me to teach the related courses. It helps when my salary is covered for the new course by the grant / innovation-related funds.
Unit supports service, but I do not believe the institution does.
My department tries to fit each faculty member's service load with what is appropriate for their rank and interests. Junior faculty start with a light load that gradually escalates. Associate-rank faculty are expected to work toward substantial service accomplishments in order to get promoted to full professor. "Substantial" means leadership experience at the departmental, unit, and university levels.
Many faculty in my unit serve at the College/University level.
We encourage faculty to participate in meaningful service as appropriate for where they are in their career and personal interests. We protect junior faculty and expect senior faculty to carry a much greater load to do this.
As rank increases it is expected more
Our department encourages involvement in university-level service.
Sufficient amount for I tenured faculty to receive tenure
It is expected for tenure, promotion and merit.
My Department values university level service
We require service at all levels for a meritorious or excellent rating in service.
faculty choose what activities to focus on.
university service is valued, but there are also expectations for department and other service
They allow it, but it doesn't count that much for tenure and promotion.
It's required for promotion to Full, and beneficial for promotion to Associate. Also, a person doing University level service sometimes is assigned less demanding departmental service duties.
there is definitely support, but again, there is the acknowledgment that much is required of us already in the department

The Mass Comm Department as a whole has been very cooperative and involved in university-wide affairs.

it's viewed as important exposure for the department

needed to get meritorious in service

As rank increases it is expected more
What service activities are you most interested in participating in?

Whatever is the least time-consuming

University-wide, I am currently a faculty fellow. All of my other service is directly related to the SON.

Union activities, administrative searches, UPBC, Dean and Provost and Chancellor reviews.
Those that draw on my expertise or benefit other faculty.
Those that benefit students directly.
Those related to academic matters
Those related directly to teaching/learning/pedagogy
Things that would only take a few hours of my time.
"Things that have a chance to be implemented that aren't rubber stamps for the administration.
Things to be avoided are make-work and stuff-olla that is being done simply to satisfy some stupid law."
The ones I am already participating in. I just came off 4 years in a University-level leadership position and am in year 3 of my second University-level committee with a possibility to Chair it in my 4th and final year. Sorry, I cannot do more. I must see my family at some point.
Sustainability, community engagement
Student-oriented activities
Student mentoring and networking events
student engagement, not committees
"Service with short, organized meetings.
Service with an impact on teaching or learning.
Service that has an END date."
service related to my area of expertise
Service related to faculty workplace conditions and student learning conditions.
Research related service
Research activities
Recruitment of prospective students and department related required service
Recruiting, curriculum development, strategic planning.
Promoting and supporting research
Project-based activities with meaningful outcomes.
"Professional service to community organizations.
Student-focused service like advising a student organization."
Participating in the higher impact Senate Committees: Curriculum, Rules and Procedures, or Welfare.

Operating papers

Ones that feel useful

Ones that can be completed in the very limited amount of free time that I have.

Ones regarding diversity, the direction of the University in terms of programs, things that have a concrete impact on students and faculty.

None.

None at the moment due to my heavy load at the department.

No additional service at this time.

My job of Program Director is interesting and fulfilling, but it is enough.

Most likely decision making and representation of underserved faculty and student population as well as the Senate.

Media and marketing related activities.

I'm interested in things to do with undergraduate curriculum and education, and I found program review interesting.

I serve on committees at the regional level, university level, and school level - so I am happy to serve in whatever capacity is needed.

I prefer to engage in service activities that directly tie back to have an impact on issues of teaching and pedagogy or that are about improving conditions for faculty members (i.e. salary equity, family leave, Title IX issues, etc.)

I prefer Councils because you can influence change right away.

I participate in program reviews and a variety of committees as needed.

I like to service areas and programs that I am passionate about

I like temporary committees that have a specific product and timeline (like a review committee).

I like teaching and student-related activities.

I have participated extensively in the international recruitment. I will also be happy to work on the graduate and research related activities.

I enjoy service activities that involve children, homeless students, and any opportunity to assist them.

I appreciate things like program review at the graduate and undergraduate level. This allows a faculty member to see how different programs do business.

I am not too sure at this stage.

I am not sure what all service activities are available to me.

Graduate Council & Program Committee.

Faculty Senate and one of the its major councils.
Faculty Ethics Committee
Faculty Association
Educational Outreach and Program Review
Don't really know what is available.
Diversity
search committees
Departmental, discipline and community
Curriculum. Finance.
Curriculum, recruitment, program developments
Curriculum development; shared governance with administrators
Curriculum and interdisciplinary work. Also, I'm interested in helping hammer home to the folks in Carbondale that the allocation isn't working.
community
At the university level, very few.
Assessment/quality review.
Areas such as research compliance, internal grants, awards committees, curriculum, faculty senate, faculty development. Not so interested in volunteering to help in the bookstore or things like that; hire more people if necessary, but don't ask us to do that.
Any that benefits SIUE
Administrator searches.
Activities that involve students.
activities that genuinely enhance student recruitment would be nice
What prevents you from being more engaged in University service?
working full time
working on my Ph.D. part-time
Work load.
Lack on interest in some of the available service roles.
What we do doesn't matter. Faculty input is just that, input. The work is busy work rather than anything substantive. The ultimate decision makers are administrators.
University Level services are not recognized by the units sometimes. Sometimes junior faculty is not sought out in those services.
Too much to do already.
Too much service at the department level
Too much service at department and college levels, as well as extensive need for service to the public.
Too many department commitments
Too few faculty and too few support staff means that we have way too much program-level work to do. I was way more involved in University service in my early days here (2000s) because we had way more faculty and way more staff.
too busy
Time. Student requests, teaching demands...
The fact that service isn't valued much for contracts/pay/promotion. It seems like a check box.” Time. Poor salary means more additional teaching. Additional teaching means less time for research and service. I am a full time graduate director that gets no course release. I am also in a small department which means we have to shoulder more service per person.
Time constraints. Too many big personalities and opinions in one room.
Time constraints
Time commitments would be the only reason I would not participate in university service, although that hasn't really stopped me in the past!
Time and other work obligations (e.g. teaching, scholarship, dept service)
time & energy, plus a fundamental commitment to teaching
Time
Time
Time
Time
The number of classes we teach prevents me from being more engaged. By the time I teach, prep, grade, and try to squeeze in some research, there is barely any time left for service. Of the time that I have for service, departmental is the most valued so university level is an
afterthought. Further, most of the work seems to have little tangible impact on the operation of
the university (because much of what the various committees suggest is just wholesale ignored
by administration) so why waste the time?

Tenure and promotion evaluation, the senior faculty if the Department favor departmental
services over university services when they evaluate dossier

Teaching, course prep, grading, correspondence, department and college service, and research
requirements. I also find that much of it is meaningless such as discussing "strategic plans" that
will frankly never really impact me unless they have action items included in operating papers
for the college or department.

Teaching load.

Teaching and research.

Some University service is really questionable viz. its value. Program review, for example, is
extremely labor and personnel intensive, and the value of contributions by the faculty carrying it
out are minimal. What's more, many universities do not perform program review this way,
sparing faculty this type of work. This is just one example, but it illustrates one way to
strategically approach the issue of faculty participation-- take an inventory of University service
and see what is truly required and what might be minimized or eliminated.

Some things I don’t find terribly useful, like program reviews and assessment. They aren’t
directly involving students or have productive outcomes.

Some committees have faculty representation but no ability to affect decision making. They are
in many ways just rubber-stamping whatever moves through the committee (an example:
UPBC).

It's time for others to step up. The same people are carrying the bulk of service at SIUE. I have
served in many high-level service positions for over twenty years, and I have had enough.

Research and teaching workload

Primary responsibilities and conflicting time commitments that stem from those.

Primarily the teaching load, and to a lesser extent, research expectations.

Other university responsibilities

Other service responsibilities.

other commitments

Other administrative responsibilities.

Opportunity

Opportunities are according to whether you are tenure-track vs. no-tenure -track professional.

Nothing.

Nothing very impactful. Most of our is advisory.

Nothing

Nothing
Not enough Time
Not enough tenured or tenure track faculty and many of the university committees have this requirement. Committees should be open to term faculty and clinical faculty as well.
Not all university service opportunities are open to clinical track faculty.
I have a clinical practice site with specific time obligations. This limits my availability to be on campus for meetings."

Need to focus on research for tenure
My willingness to serve on committees instead of working on research.

My schedule and time requirements of the service opportunities
My own limitations, mostly. There are sane limits to this after which it is pretty much pointless.
My interest and willingness is limited by other faculty who participate but seem to do so unwillingly or with little interest in thoughtful conversations about the curriculum; who simply think that university service is a 'rubber-stamp' on college or department decisions
my duties as a program director and my desire to do research and maintain quality teaching
My departmental and program-level service commitments.
Most of the services hour I provide are done outside my normal job hours (8:00 - 5:00), so it is hard to give a percentage of my work time. It is generally incorporated into my free time.
Making sure I am keeping other commitments.
Limited time and resources. I have outside obligations.
Lack of time. Service at other levels.
lack of time; unsure which opportunities NTT are welcome
Lack of time
It's not interesting, or it seems like a lot of busywork that won't affect any real change or benefit, or it's such a huge time commitment I can't fit it in
Insufficient time available. Many service opportunities seem to create busy work rather than provide an opportunity to make a real difference.
In addition to previous comments, I minimize University level service for one primary reason - the Faculty Association. While not the only vehicle for university service, the faculty senate (at least in the past) was the central vehicle for this service.
When the minority of outspoken faculty was trying to sell the benefits of an FA, they publicly and falsely claimed that a FA would work to support the Senate...not replace it. This was a complete falsehood. The Senate now is simply an extension of FA control - the overlap in membership is quite significant. Any concept of independent, shared governance has gone out the window.
I will not join, participate in or serve the FA. And as the Senate is still the primary platform of University service (if only through meaningless "check box" activities), I will not serve the FA
by serving in the Senate or any of the mechanisms put in place by the Senate as part of its (now limited) purview.

What prevents me? The FA. Period. And I will continue to encourage my colleagues to “opt out” of FA related activities."

I'm invested in my students and the academic community, but I don't know how to work out balancing work, life, and service with being a contingent faculty member.

I think sometimes we as faculty make things much more difficult than they need to be and service commitments can be all-encompassing when in reality some of them should be not so difficult. It's hard to find University-level service that is not exceptionally time-intensive.

I think I'm doing about as much as I can. This survey doesn't address Departmental and College service, which already takes up an awful lot of many faculty's time.

I teach across my department's curriculum b/c we don't have enough faculty.

I have felt my leadership was needed more at the department level. Once I have committed to other service, there is not much time left to take on an additional responsibility.

I have class on Thursday afternoons so no university senate work. Otherwise I have found committees that work.

I have a lot of responsibilities with teaching and researching.

I feel that I am very engaged in Service that matters.

I feel quite engaged

I do not feel as though there is a university "buy in" in terms of service and commitment. I work with a variety of employees in several different capacities and I have found that they are quite frustrated with the overall demeanor and morale of the campus. If administration would value and appreciate us, perhaps we (I) would feel the need to participate.

I believe University service is important, but we no longer have grad assistants. It seems like the demands for training and paperwork keep increasing, so I have less time devote to service than we used to years ago.

I am willing to take on one "large" service commitment each year, and will take on a second if urgent. If I took on a large project for CAS, then I would not take on a large university-level project. Similarly, there are some department level projects coming up (like a curriculum revamp) that will also be a "large" effort.

I am very much engaged, but sometimes I see repetition and inefficiency.

I am simply not interested in it.

I am plenty engaged in it

I am not prevented

I am department chair. I am also active in being associate editor of journals and conferences. This leaves me much less time to be devoted to the university level service.
I am department chair, and I don't know how much shared governance really exists between Faculty Senate/Univ. Committees and Administration such that Univ. service sometimes seems futile.

I already have too much going on.

Honestly? This present administration (Office of the Provost) has made many in my unit feel discouraged about engagement at the university level. It takes that office forever to respond to important issues like grievances, job searches, etc., and then when they do, the decisions made are rarely in the best interest of the faculty and students. I've lost faith in that office and it makes it hard to get motivated to volunteer my time to serve. Hence, I focus more heavily on my teaching and research which I find more rewarding.

Geographic location

Focus on teaching and the need to engage in scholarship

External demands on department from accrediting bodies.

Distance, job responsibility.

Departmental service; teaching; non-university responsibilities (outside of work hours).

I have tried to inquire about a few programs through student affairs but received no response."

Departmental needs

College level service

At this point I'm overly engaged - I can't keep up with the amount of service I do. I think more thought needs to be put into workload and what reasonably can be handled, then if there are enough people to handle the work of service. There are many faculty devoted to doing service, but they are becoming burnt out by the demands.

At the moment I'm very engaged.

As NTT Faculty, the message is that we are second rate and our opinions do not matter and therefore, our service in university-wide initiatives is unnecessary or unwelcome. Only service within my unit or for/with NTT specific issues seems valued.

Already spending more time than I would like on Service

All the service I am already doing, in addition to existing teaching and research duties that I both am required to perform, and take seriously, and the fact that I missed out on so much of my family's life over the last decade that I made a promise to them and to myself to not be working more than 50 hours a week. My work already creeps into evenings and weekends. This would be even more true if more of my weekday time were to be spent in committee meetings.

All my regular work still piles up. There is no formal or informal benefit to doing service. No release time, no compensation, not really even much appreciation.

Again, don't know what's available

Administration as a new chair.

Acknowledging service in tenure and promotion.
What suggestions do you have for increasing faculty involvement in University service?

Work to make NTT faculty feel as if they have a voice, belong, and are appreciated from a university level.

There are really no incentives for being involved. Perhaps there should be?

Maybe the expectations should be adjusted - if faculty don't want to be involved, maybe instead of trying to increase interest there should be a look at all the university level committees. Do they all truly need to exist? Could the duties of some of them be combined? Could the number of meetings be reduced?"

Teaching and research are more valued. Perhaps if service were more valued.

Streamlining committees and faculty senate. Making sure a few people with strong opinions don't monopolize everyone else's time.

Streamline Curriculum Committees

Somehow getting people to realize its importance. I also think limiting university level to faculty members past midpoint or tenured. I think with time there is more knowledge of the university and a more vested interest. Term limits too! Although I know some people can stay on for a long time, I think having a steady rotation helps innovation.

Some inducement.

Perhaps a link to tenure/promotion policies

Some departments don't value it, I think. Making it worthwhile for merit and tenure/promotion would be an incentive.

Show how university work relates to day to day operation of education that occurs within departments.

Service needs to be rewarded at every level through P&T, annual evals, etc. seeing value, relevance, and impact beyond paperwork.

Require more male colleagues to participate.

Reduce workload in another area

Reduce teaching load.

Reduce mandated assessment and reporting, plus prove to faculty that their contributions are respected or mean anything

Recognize University service towards promotion and tenure consistently across Schools/units.

Reaching out to lower level instructors for matters that take up only a few hours each month.

Providing more information about what specific service commitments involve

Not sure this will be helpful, but some service is more meaningful than other service. Some of the busy work committees make it hard to be motivated.

More recognition or pay and equality for the university level services might be helpful.

More frequent announcements
Minimize the burden or find a better way to distribute it. Especially for smaller department the service burden is disproportionate.

Make the significance of the service directly relatable to the student and faculty being impacted by the service.

Make the incentives real and pay better salaries so we can hire better people.

Make sure the service is meaningful and really necessary.

Make sure that faculty are listened to!

Make sure junior faculty are not overloaded or blocked from service. p.s. on the next question there is no such rank as 'Full Professor' and you don't have Distinguished Research Professor listed

Make it count more for tenure. Have the administration support it counting more for tenure (not just talk). Have administration be more accepting that a lot of the function of the university is dependent on faculty service. I don't get a warm and fuzzy feeling from the administration. We get thanked once a year and that is it. I don't do service so I can get thanked. I do it because I hope that my efforts help make the university better and ensures a quality education for the students and makes the best use of their money and the taxpayers money.

Make it a requirement as part of their contract when hired

Make goals more clear and show that the work done has impact. Most of the times actions decided through a lot of debate and involvement in the Faculty Senate has no follow up or is not implemented by the administration.

Make all faculty aware. NNT faculty really aren't given the opportunity to participate in University service (I do a ton of unit service and service with professional organizations). It is discouraging and in my opinion, make NTT faculty feel as though we are not part of the university community. I've had TT faculty say to me that I shouldn't be given service opportunities because TT need those opportunities, not me. Service is included in my promotion papers, too.

Limit the University service that is covered by other institutions on campus.

Limit frequent in person meetings or allowing others to zoom in for meetings when we can't physically be present.

Inform young/new faculty of the advantages and opportunities.

Incentivize it, especially for tenured faculty. Once a person is tenured, there are more ways to say no because their job is never going to be on the line for doing so. If we incentivize more teaching, can't we do the same for service?

Incentives

if we want to increase faculty involvement in University service, we must find a way to decrease responsibilities in other areas or to make it so that University service more directly complements responsibilities in other areas

If it is an expectation for P&T, the department chair should evaluate as part of the annual review.
When opportunities arise for university service, the department chair should be aware of who "needs" service and should recommend them for the appointment or highly encourage them to volunteer.

Identify low-service individuals and target them for recruitment with incentives. Do not just---please please please do not just---send out blanket calls for service needs. Those of us who are doing a lot are the sort to possibly step up at great additional cost and burden to ourselves. Please create structures that prevent us from harming ourselves.

I'm sorry. I really don't have at the moment.

I'm not sure because it all comes down to how each dept has service requirements written into its operating papers. If its required for P and T, then you get people serving.

I think everyone is just stretched SO thin with service that I think it's hard to find people able to take on more service at ALL levels!

I suggest creating a collective pool of all the available service responsibilities with brief descriptions of each on a specific university web page, so that faculty can select from the list which opportunity fits their interest and schedule the most.

I really don't know. At least regarding Senate, when I was there I felt like some departments/schools could be more selective about the people that they let represent them. First year faculty in Senate- that's ridiculous and unfair to the freshmen faculty. Also maybe don't impose your biggest whiner or windbag on the rest of us.

I know it isn't likely, but offering pay/stipends for getting contingent faculty involved might help.

I feel it is an opportunity to become aware of university wide engagement

I don't recommend that we do increase university service. And I don't believe that we can, because our contracts and layers upon layers of policies are so rigid.

But if we must increase faculty involvement in University service, adjust teaching and research expectations to make room for more service. (Good luck!)

Hire more faculty so we can cover everything that we have to do, and increase teaching loads for those who choose not to do service.

Hire enough faculty and staff.

Highlight the skills learned and/or honed from "entry-level" to leading service opportunities (i.e., what's in it for them other than ticking a required box for T&P).

Giving lower teaching/scholarship requirements to meet tenure if you want to increase service load.

Get rid of the stuff that is done to justify an administration decision that has already been made.

I'd say get rid of the stuff that isn't useful to the U; but is done only because it is required by law. But it's required by law.

get rid of committees that aren't really needed. Reduce redundancy; don't expect people to do it all; reduce bureaucracy.

Funding for FOOD, if it is a lunch time meeting.
The ability for the committees to make CHANGES that impact and improve student learning and teaching.

A category or "rank" for committees or service so you are allowed to say "no" to something/someone else asking for you to serve on something else."

Find ways for us to spend less time on paperwork.

Figure out a way to have less of it and create less time-intensive options (efficiency!)

Fewer layers, more impact.

Faculty involvement begins with respect. Once the university respects its employees, by providing livable wages for the work given, getting rid of unqualified management and hiring effective leaders, and being open to new ideas, only then will employees feel the need to be more involved. At this point, there is a lot of frustration regarding the above items and it is difficult to find the desire to go above and beyond when your place of employment does the bare minimum for you as the individual.

Everyone should be paid for their work.

Decrease expectations for department and school level service

Create equal opportunities for all and let professionals have a choice regardless of their rank. if they can do the job then they should not be prevented from engaging in University service.

Compensation for time in form of course release or stipend.

Committees should be open to term faculty and clinical faculty as well. Not just tenured and tenure track.

Bite-sized pieces. Many Faculty Senate appointments expand to occupy 3 Thursdays each month. Can we spread out the love? Chairing a committee can occupy from 4 to 6 Thursdays (yes) each month.

Be very honest with new faculty about service and how it can deleteriously affect their careers.

Be on the lookout. But stay out of work heavy assignment if you are new because that will hurt your scholarship production.

Attach more weight to service in tenure and promotion decisions, particularly for associate professors seeking promotion to full, and encourage departments to keep faculty members in the same service roles long enough that they become comfortable in their roles and effective. The biggest issue that I’ve seen is the high turnover rate in service roles and the bad faculty-service role matches that occur as a result. Oftentimes, the person selected to serve on a committee or chair is not the best person for the role. They were just the best person who had time to do it or gave in to the arm-twisting. A person in that situation might feel in over their head or lacking expertise or interest in the work. They end up doing the bare minimum or less.

Allow committees to meet utilizing technology (like Zoom) to allow faculty who are not based on campus to participate.

a sense of definite accomplishment

a clearer explanation of what the purpose and impact will be.
1) Get rid of the FA - or at least give faculty a real, honest and transparent opportunity to VOTE on representation. The FA was “Obama Card-Checked” into existence in the shadows through an intentionally opaque process - that did not involve formal, democratic balloting. Since the FA has come into existence, a vocal and agenda-driven minority has created negative and confrontational interactions between the faculty and the administration through threats, intimidation and false accusations. This has naturally invaded the Faculty Senate. Who would want to willingly participate in such a negative and destructive endeavor? While getting rid of the FA won't guarantee increased participation in University Service, keeping it WILL guarantee fewer and fewer faculty willing to participate in this service.

2) Eliminate service for the FA from having an impact on evaluations and tenure & promotion decisions for all faculty regardless of position in the FA. Service in/through/to the FA is not service - it is self-serving. It does not serve the University. It serves only FA membership. Thus it is a clear conflict of interest.

3) Our colleagues in Org and Industrial Psych tell us that we will get what we measure. The goal, as stated in this question, is incorrect. We do not want “increasing faculty involvement.” That simply leads to more people showing up to check boxes. We want opportunities for meaningful faculty involvement. This is what should be articulated in unit working papers and in evaluation processes. Define it, measure it, and include it in the evaluation process, and that is exactly what we will get. If the University is not willing to do this (and push back against the FA’s efforts to dumb things down to the lowest common denominator so that everyone gets the same things just for showing up), then don't waste any more time because things won't change - they will just continue to get worse."

1. Make it meaningful. Some seek out what is perceived to be “easy” service just to fulfill their service obligation without it taking time away from teaching or scholarship. This leads to service/committees not doing meaningful work, looking for shortcuts, or just rubber-stamping anything coming their way.

2. Spread out service more evenly. While those who are not yet tenured should have lighter service, they still need to learn how the university works to contribute meaningfully in the future. Many associates find themselves overly burdened all of a sudden after tenure, which is a huge adjustment. While we cannot force people into service, there needs to be a way to ensure that it doesn't continually fall on the same people over and over.

3. Find some way to reward service. Some object to this because of the potential of abuse, but not one disagrees with the standard advice of “No one gets tenure for service.” The assumption there is that service is self-sacrificing and earns one nothing - not merit pay, not promotion, and certainly not any awards. Perhaps alternate promotion pathways or departments actually shifting responsibilities will help faculty feel that if they give their time to service they aren't just taking on an additional burden that isn't appreciated, let alone awarded?
Additional Comments
When some of my students see me as so busy they don't know how I balance everything...how unhappy does that make me about being a role model? When some of my students thank me for spending a few minutes talking with them and really listening to their concerns...what impression does that leave me about the rest of their experiences at the university?

Unfortunately, I think people dread service, especially faculty senate that takes up quite a lot of time. I actually really enjoyed my time and appreciated all the issues that I got to work on and administrators I was allowed to meet and talk with on a regular basis. I wonder if there needs to be a better PR job on the benefits to the individual rather than the burden of this type of service.

This survey is an example of the real problems with faculty involvement. Without input from one of our senators, I would not have known any of the subtext for this survey. This is not just about increasing faculty involvement in university service. There is a lot more going on. Try being a bit more open and transparent. Hard to do with the overlapping membership of FS and FA. And especially hard to do when you realize how negatively your peers would react to the hidden, nonsensical agendas.

the percentages given are very rough - suffice it to say that I am still spending the most time on teaching, but scholarship is increasingly being pushed out of the way to make room for service

The Faculty Association says they want to reduce my uncompensated service and yet all they are doing is increasing it. It's a very vocal minority.

The contract with the faculty union has gone so far as to say that faculty are no longer required to do service at every level. How many faculty members, then, are going to routinely shun departmental service to do university service instead?

The advent of a faculty union has changed the opportunity level. For example, the Faculty Senate now has much less power. The relationship with the Administration is now adversarial, whereas before it is cooperative. Time will tell if this is positive or negative, but it definitely changes things.

Thank you for undertaking this effort!

Survey is not clear about what percentage of service means.

Some university committees now have a diminished role as a result of the Faculty Association and the collective bargaining agreement. Faculty care about SIUE and want to contribute in meaningful ways. If a university committee is not considered meaningful, many faculty will not volunteer to serve on that committee, given their heavy teaching responsibilities and research agendas. Perhaps a new university committee is warranted in light of the CBA, allowing some coordination with the FA for better communication and consistency.

Service just seems to be this extra thing that some people do because they like to be involved or something. It is not viewed as part of the job. Maybe that is because if you have two faculty, one does lots of research and gets papers published and one that does service and doesn't get as many papers published, guess which one gets more attention and kudo's and automatic promotion/tenure? The one with the more papers. The one without so many papers gets told that they need to publish more papers and what have they been doing with themselves? Also, some also are on committees that never meet or if they do the faculty member does the absolute
minimum. Just is a member to get the check mark for promotion/tenure. Not sure if there is a solution here.

Service is great, from the perspective of the individual. However, faculty shouldn't let service take too much time away from teaching and scholarship.

Service at the university is undervalued and NOT comparable across groups, colleges, committees, schools. It seems the university RUNS on service, yet there are few benefits for attending/being in service.

Service and Research do NOT go together. You have to sacrifice one to do more of the other. If you want research active faculty, you need to allow them to engage in less service.

Parts of service, when the involvement of the individual becomes too time consuming, should be remunerated. The university administrators should at least consider this.

It seems as though the faculty are expected to run this institution on top of teaching. I think we need more administrative assistants to support us.

I was not going to fill this out, since I'm not guaranteed work here every semester. However, I thought this input might be valuable.

I was not at the October meeting, but am wondering what kinds of university-level service needs are not being met that it prompts this survey.

I think the climate varies a lot by department. Service in general is seen to be less important that teaching and scholarship.

I think that there should be fewer committees and fewer appointment requirements on committees, campus wide. Redundancies in committees with other roles (E.g., faculty union) should lead to removal of committees. Committees should not exist with the primary function of making people feel important. There should also be less requirement for everyone to check everything. E.g., curriculum development process is a nightmare with so many steps.

I really do enjoy helping when I can. I am limited by time and resources.

I feel like at SIUE the typical solution to all problems is to create a committee. Too often committees discuss issues but there are few if any action items implemented.

Have we ever looked into whether the amount of service breaks down evenly by gender among SIUE faculty?

For many service opportunities, it's just busy work. For the policy related committees, it's all just recommendations and no actual teeth. So, why do it all if the admin can just say "no thanks" and make you (or someone else) start over again. That is pointless and frustrating. I stopped participating in any of that busy work as soon as I could.

Doing extra service does not benefit faculty. It is just extra work on top of everything else.

Before you rush to action we need to let the CBA "dust settle"....schools and departments have not yet had a chance to rewrite their operating papers.

A ridiculous amount of departmental and school service is required in 2019 compared to earlier expectations. This is partly due to external influences such as accreditation agencies, but internal expectations such as (just one example) the vast effort that is required for University assessment. Note that University assessment was essentially a non-issue until fairly recently. Now it requires
a large amount of effort. Something has to ize and Faculty Senate service and related committees are luxuries that can be ignored. Another huge drain on time are the number of recruitment-related activities at the School and Department level.

1) The faculty senate has been a sham that has simply been doing the administrations makework in the name of "shared governance".

2) Had the faculty senate been doing its job, unionization wouldn't have been necessary.

3) At this point, there's little for faculty senate to do -- most any change that it would propose to implement is likely to have to be approved by the union(s).

4) In fact, that's what one of the presidents of one of the unions implied what they said “I'm not even sure it will be needed anymore.”
IBHE-FAC report for the SIUE Faculty Senate meeting on 6 February 2020

The Illinois Board of Higher Education – Faculty Advisory Council (IBHE-FAC) has met twice since the Senate meeting in December 2019.

The IBHE-FAC met on 10 December 2019 at DePaul University in Chicago, Illinois.

IBHE Chair John Atkinson introduced himself to the FAC. Discussion topics included: his intent to continue work on a master plan for higher ed in Illinois; dual credit; how to prepare students for the future – thinking and learning, but also fundamental skills; the roles of private, proprietary, two-year and four-year institutions; the balance among tenure-track, adjunct faculty, and administrative positions; importance of engaging faculty with data driven retention and inclusivity efforts; mental health issues; student preparation and pathways to degrees/certificates; and bridging gaps between higher ed and industry.

IBHE Deputy Director Stephanie Bernoteit reviewed the Joint Advisory Council looking at scaling up effective developmental education programs (https://www.ibhe.org/Senate-Joint-Resolution-41.html) and the transfer credit working group.

Marie Donovan (FAC Chair) discussed the day’s schedule. Working groups and caucuses met. November and October minutes were approved. Brought from the Two-year Caucus, there was discussion about changing some FAC meetings to have more caucus or working group time to facilitate CC folks meeting with the Community College Faculty Association. After discussion of the schedule and timing issues, the motion was made and passed that the February meeting at DeVry would be half whole-group and half working-group, with working group time in the afternoon. The March meeting will probably be in Springfield to facilitate the CCFA meeting. Kendall Thu and Andy Howard volunteered to work with Marie on a statement about full-time faculty. Working groups reported out. Most are still discussing and gathering information. This We Believe shared a letter they would like to send to media; a motion was made and passed to approve the letter as coming from the FAC.

Illinois State Representative Kelly Burke (D-36) talked with the FAC. She was the chair of the House Higher Education Committee, as well as chair of the Higher Education Appropriations Committee, and is co-founder of the bipartisan Higher Education Working Group. Discussion topics included: dual credit, college affordability and changing times; mental health; performance based funding and the need for accountability for the money spent on higher education; and the need to look beyond 18-20 year olds and consider all the needs of society for many types of education.

Marie and DePaul were thanked for hosting. The FAC adjourned to attend the IBHE meeting occurring that afternoon.
The IBHE-FAC met on 17 January 2020 at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville in Edwardsville, Illinois.

SIUE Chancellor Randy Pembrook reviewed the history and highlighted some current initiatives of SIUE, including the Successful Communities Collaborative, program growth, recent Carnegie reclassification, and receiving the Higher Education Excellence in Diversity for the sixth year in a row. Discussion topics included: SIUE/SIUC relationships, P20 outreach, and performance based funding.

IBHE Liaison Gretchen Lohman reported that the master plan is an IBHE priority. Co-remediation and developmental education task groups have public meetings and their information is on the IBHE website. Work on institution closures is ongoing – licensure records are also an issue. Institutions should have a plan for managing record in the event of closure to support (former) students who need credit for prior training.

Dominic Dorsey, Director of SIUE ACCESS and Chair of the newly revitalized IBHE Disability Services Advisory Council talked with the council. Disabilities are one of the last civil rights frontiers. Universal Design, essential abilities and technical standards, and supporting faculty are all key topics. Discussion also included working with students early in their college careers or without formal accommodation letters, as well as emotional support animals and how the DAC will interface with the IBHE.

Illinois State Representative Katie Stuart (D-112) talked with the FAC. She is vice-chair of the House Higher Education Committee, as well as involved with the bipartisan Higher Education Working Group. Discussion topics included: the need to rebuild Illinois higher education; capital plans; shortening the time to lower tuition for employees’ families; developmental education; financial aid for students; teacher education; dual credit; performance based funding; adjunct faculty roles; the Illinois Prosper program; and whether ACT/SAT scores should be optional – if so, how might admissions and placement be affected.

SIUE announced plans to close at 1:00 p.m. due to the weather. The meeting adjourned for lunch after thanking Sue Wiediger, Shelly Goebel-Parker, and SIUE for hosting.

The next IBHE-FAC meeting will be Friday 21 February 2020 at DeVry University (Loop Campus) in Chicago, Illinois, with working group meetings in the afternoon.

With regards, Susan D. Wiediger, representative for SIUE to the IBHE-FAC. For more information about any of these items, please contact me at swiedig@siue.edu.
Curriculum Council Report, January 2020

The Curriculum Council met twice on January 16 and 30, 2020 mainly to discuss program reviews.

The Council voted on changes to its operating papers regarding the Director of Assessment duties. Proposed duties include: 1) Serves as a liaison with departments and programs that seek and maintain specialized accreditation, 2) Oversees, guides and facilitates the annual assessment reporting process, 3) Manages and maintains a record of current assessment plans for undergraduate and graduate programs, 4) Offers faculty development training on assessment processes as well assessment reporting workshops for new program directors and chairs. These changes were unanimously approved.

Enrollment management (Chris Leopold) reported that Spring 2020 enrollment is down 2.9% or 358 students compared to January 16 last year. Although undergraduate enrollment is down 5.3%, graduate student enrollment is up by 9.6%. Fall to spring freshmen persistence is down 2.6%, a difference of 40 students compared to last year. The official spring census occurred over the weekend of January 24 and that could have changed some of these numbers. For fall 2020, freshman apps and admits are both up by 26%, and Springboard deposits (used as an indicator for planning to enroll) are up by 54 students compared to this week last year. Transfer applications are down by 3.9% but transfer admits are still running even with last year.

Associate Provost Elza Ilbrocheva from the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Planning is working with Susan Morgan, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, to discuss areas of improvement from midpoint Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Report. There are some instances where both undergraduate and graduate programs in the same department have the identical learning outcomes. The plan is to work with those departments to encourage them to have different outcomes that reflect the advanced level of graduate programs.

Program reviews included Anthropology (CAS) and three from the School of Education, Health and Human Behavior: Psychology, Public Health, and Speech Language Pathology and Audiology. Although voting on the latter two was suspended due to lack of a quorum, Psychology and Public Health were both unanimously rated in Good Standing with enrollments Sustainable at Current Levels.
Rules & Procedures Council (RPC) Report

Chair: Wai Hsien Cheah

2/6/20

The Director of Institutional Research and Studies, Dr. Phillip Brown provided the council with the list of tenure track, tenured, and clinical faculty on January 22, 2020. Dr. Junvie Pailden conducted the apportionment calculation using the Webster method. The allocation of seats by unit can be found in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>SEATS ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEHBB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOB</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the apportionment calculation, both SOE and SON gained a seat each, and SEHBB and SOB each lost a seat for academic calendar year 2020-2021.

The names of faculty in the Grievance Committee with terms expiring in academic calendar year 2019-2020 were requested. The election notices to the various units will be sent out shortly.

The Chancellor’s annual evaluation is currently in progress. The Qualtrics link was sent out to tenure-line, tenured, and clinical faculty on February 1, 2020. The evaluation will close on February 15, 2020. The Provost’s annual evaluation will begin on February 16 and ends on March 2.

The Faculty Senate President election will start on February 15 and ends on March 1. The result of the election will be announced in the March full faculty senate meeting. Lastly, the election for the two at-large membership on Graduate Council will be carried out in March.
President’s Report to Faculty Senate Executive Committee
February 6, 2020

Constituency Heads Meeting
12/9/19
Discussed adding constituency heads comment time to BOT Wednesday meetings, rather than constituency heads having to sign up for public comment.
Discussed having graduate faculty status for the length of the contract, so these don’t have to be repeatedly renewed yearly
Want to institute a program of holiday giving for employees next year (2020)

Standing Meeting with Provost Cobb
12/17/19
We discussed who in the provost’s office would be good liaisons for each proposed council and discussed the likelihood of being able to link a person to each council.
Discussed faculty not endorsing the hiring practices in student affairs.
Faculty would like a seat on the enrollment management for retention search (if there is a search)
Shared gratitude for the declared snow day/university closure and policy being followed
Mentioned that some parts of the overall budget should be reported out to faculty senate

Diversity Council
12/18/19
Professional development policy to allow time off to attend events such as Diversity Day. Still needs to be approved. Proposal asks for up to 40 hours/year of release time (will follow up with Chancellor when he visits the February FS meeting.
Students: will hold the tunnel of oppression during Greek Week (March 21-28)
Staff Senate: Creation of staff ombuds position still very preliminary but going forward; loosely modeled after faculty ombuds
Diversity Summit January 22 in the MUC conference center 8-11AM

UQC Meeting
12/6/19 and 1/9/20
Discussed strategic plan KPIs for each of the 6 goals

Standing Meeting with Provost Cobb
1/9/20
Again discussed hiring practices and how to go forth with potentially drafting a proposal if Faculty Senate wishes to go forward with it. Talked about additional potential areas where Faculty Senate might want a representative on the committee or consultation.

Diversity Council
1/16/2020
Operating papers are finishing up
Meridian Scholar selection committee was discussed. I will be serving on it.
Spring Diversity Summit has been rescheduled. It is now March 25, 2020 8-11:30 in the MUC.
Faculty Staff Appreciation Committee
1/8/2020, 1/17/2020, 1/31/2020
Discussed the upcoming event for Faculty and Staff appreciation. It will be held April 15 from 2-6 PM (to get as many people across numerous shifts as possible). No theme. Will likely have “yard games” and BBQ. Main question: How will we encourage faculty to attend?
Will meet weekly until the major details are nailed down

Constituency Heads Meeting
1/30/2020
Constituency heads were not given a designated speaking time at the BOT meetings
Student government end-of-year report just came out
State of the Black Union is February 6; 9-2
Black Excellence Gala will be held March 7 with guest speaker Latasha Fox
We talked through the idea of crafting a policy that identifies which positions on campus need faculty and/or staff consultation or representation on the search committees. Staff senate and Faculty senate will work on identifying these positions.
The BOT requested a tuition and fees proposal with zero increase for 2020-2021