The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 2:30pm on Thursday, April 2, 2020 via Zoom by President DeGroot Brown.


Absent: Kim Carter, Michelle Cathorall, Richard Flight, Nima Lotfi Yagin, Andy Lozowski, Vince Rapini, Brad Reed, Jeffrey Sabby, Susan Wiediger (ex officio), Bin Zhou

Announcements:
Announcements were reviewed as listed on the agenda.

Consideration of Minutes:
The minutes for the March 5, 2020 meeting were approved as amended.

Action Items:
A second reading of changes to the Curriculum Council Operating Papers were heard. There was a motion and second to approve the papers, and it was adopted unanimously.

There was a first reading of changes to University Admissions Policy 1E1 submitted by the Curriculum Council at the recommendation of International Studies and Tom Jordan. Changes were reviewed, and the floor was opened to questions. The change is only for undergraduate students. Departments and Admissions would be able to track outcomes.

Sorin Nastasia and Brittany Peterson were presented as appointments to serve on the One More Thought Lecture Series Committee. There was a motion and second to approve the appointments, and it was adopted unanimously. The Vice Chancellor for Administration position has been posted, and constituency heads have asked for representation on the search committee.

Unfinished Business:
There was no unfinished business.
New Business:
There was no new business.

Reports from Standing Committees:
The University Planning and Budget Committee (UPBC) is working on the second round of Innovation Grant reviews. The Committee for Higher Administrator Performance Appraisals (CHAPA) is moving forward with the Chancellor’s review and plan to present it to him the first week of May.

The IBHE report was posted to SharePoint and is attached.

Reports from Council Chairs:
The Faculty Development Council should be finished with Excellence in Undergraduate Education (EUE) proposals in a week.

The Curriculum Council and Rules and Procedures Council reports were posted to SharePoint and are attached.

The Welfare and Governance Council has not been able to get feedback from Tom Jordan about the changes to the Grievance Policy, so it will be finalized next academic year. They will review a Dual Career Policy at their next meeting.

The Graduate Council reported that Homeland Security has relaxed rules around international students regarding online coursework, so they will be able to do everything the rest of the semester without difficulty. The Carnegie Committee has asked for a postponement. A change to operating papers was initiated to ensure that the Graduate Committee on Assessment was looped through the Graduate Council.

The Past President and President-Elect had no reports.

The President shared her appreciation for the continuation of work. Faculty Senate input was requested on the grading policy that was distributed, and a compromise that allows students to petition letter grades into a pass or no credit allows for exceptions. The recent Faculty Senate resolution was also sent to SIUC’s Faculty Senate President, and it will be sent out to media before the Board of Trustees meeting. Search committee work is continuing. A decision on July classes will be made at a later date, but the intent is to get back into the classroom when possible. Changes to the Faculty Senate structure are still being considered.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.
Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 2:57pm.

Submitted by Anne Hunter, University Governance
I. CALL TO ORDER
II. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Board of Trustees Meeting April 30 at SIUC
III. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
   a. March 5, 2020
IV. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Second Read – Curriculum Council Operating Papers
   b. First Read – Revision to University Admission Policy 1E1
   c. Faculty representation on committee
V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
VI. NEW BUSINESS
VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
    a. UPBC – Nancy Lutz
    b. IBHE Faculty Advisory Council – Susan Wiediger
VIII. 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
IX. PUBLIC COMMENT
X. ADJOURNMENT
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Curriculum Council Operating Papers

I. Membership

The membership of the Curriculum Council will be determined in accord with the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (Bylaws VI, Section C).

A. The Curriculum Council shall have representation distributed as follows:

1. Faculty Representation: The Executive Committee shall appoint to the Council a minimum of nine to twelve faculty (as defined by the Faculty Senate) representatives from among those elected by academic units. Terms of office shall be for one year, with annual reappointment by the Executive Committee.

2. Student Representation: Two students shall be appointed to the Council by the Student Senate for annual terms. Students must qualify for membership in the Student Senate. These representatives shall be voting members of the Council.

3. The following shall be ex-officio, voting members of the Council: the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, the University Registrar, the Director of Educational Outreach, the Director of Academic Advising, the Director of Learning Support Services, the Director of Assessment, the Director of General Education or their designated representatives, and the Chair of the General Education Committee. The following shall be ex-officio, non-voting member of the Council: Director of the Honors Program.

II. Officers

A. The Chairperson of the Curriculum Council for the coming year shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate Past-President, President, and President-Elect in accord with Faculty Senate Bylaws V, Section B. This appointment shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval at the May meeting.

B. The Chairperson of the Curriculum Council shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Convene and facilitate regular meetings of the Council.

2. Appoint Chairs of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee, Undergraduate Courses Committee, Undergraduate Programs Committee, and ad hoc Committees with Council approval; appoint a Secretary of the Council and other officers, with approval of the Council.

3. With the Chair of the General Education Committee, identify and present to the Curriculum Council membership recommendations for this Committee.

4. Serve as member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
Faculty Senate

5. Serve as liaison for the Council to the University Governance Office, for purposes of monitoring the progress of course/program change requests through the review and approval process; maintaining up to date Curriculum Council minutes and other documents on-line.

6. Attend and report regularly to the Faculty Senate on the work of the Council, including any items needing Senate review and/or action.

7. Maintain Curriculum Council records of course/program approval actions, amendments to Operating Papers, and other actions of Curriculum Council Committees.

8. Provide leadership to the Council in matters relevant to the Council's charge, consistent with the Council's powers and functions, described in Section III of the Curriculum Council Operating Papers.

C. The Secretary of the Council shall take minutes at all meetings of the Council and submit these minutes to the Chairperson for review.

III. Powers and Functions

A. The powers and functions of the Curriculum Council are those established by the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (Bylaws V, Section G). The Curriculum Council is responsible to the Faculty Senate for formulating and recommending policy on undergraduate curriculum (instructional programs, courses of study, definitions of certificates, diplomas, degrees, student entrance, retention and exit), for formulating and reviewing undergraduate curricular policy proposals, for reviewing the administration of all undergraduate curricular matters, and for conducting undergraduate program reviews. "Undergraduate" shall be defined as including both dental and continuing education students.

B. Illustrative of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Curriculum Council are the following:

1. Recommending policy on requirements for entrance, retention, and graduation for undergraduates.

2. Recommending policy on requirements for undergraduate majors and minors.

3. Recommending policy on adopting new programs or eliminating existing programs.

4. Recommending policy on grading students.

5. Recommending policy on accepting credit from other institutions or testing programs.

6. Recommending policy on advising undergraduates.

7. Recommending policy concerning the special problems that may arise with regard to teaching undergraduates at centers other than the main campus.
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8. Maintaining a continuing review and evaluation of Continuing Education programs.

9. Maintaining a continuing review and evaluation of undergraduate programs and courses. The Curriculum Council shall review each program review committee’s report. Once a committee report has been approved, the Council shall evaluate whether the program is in good standing, is flagged for priority review, or should have its enrollment suspended. A program is flagged for priority review when it has substantial areas of concern. The priority review will occur in a time and manner as determined by the Illinois Board of Higher Education regulations. If the priority review does not show substantial improvement in the program, the Curriculum Council, in consultation with the Provost, can suspend enrollment.

10. Recommending policy regarding the University’s Assessment Plan.

11. Participating in the selection of the Director of Assessment when a vacancy occurs and when the term of office of the incumbent Director is expiring.

12. Participating in the selection of the Director of General Education when a vacancy occurs and when the term of office of the incumbent Director is expiring.

IV. Meetings

A. The Curriculum Council shall normally meet the third Thursday of each month at 2:30 p.m. Special meetings will be called by the chairperson when deemed necessary.

B. A quorum shall consist of the physical presence of at least half of the total number of voting members of the Curriculum Council. Members of the Curriculum Council who wish to remotely attend Council meetings (e.g., by telephone or electronically) can only do so in a manner consistent with the Illinois Open Meetings Act, and with consent of the Chairperson.

C. Agenda of Meetings

1. The chairperson shall prepare the agenda of meetings.

2. Council members may place items on the agenda by request to the chairperson.

3. Notice of the time, place and agenda of all meetings of the Council shall be delivered to all members of the Council, and in compliance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act, made available to the public at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

4. A maximum of 15 minutes shall be allotted at the end of the meeting for public comment. No individual speaker shall be allowed to speak for more than 5 minutes.

V. Standing Committees and Operations

A. Undergraduate Programs Committee (UPC)
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1. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall be appointed from among the members of the Council by the Council Chairperson with the approval of a majority of the Council. The term of office shall be one year; the same chairperson may not serve more than three successive terms.

2. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall appoint at least five additional members to the Committee, ensuring a simple majority of faculty is always present. These appointments shall be approved by a majority of the Council. The term of Committee members shall be one year; they may succeed themselves, but cannot hold more than three consecutive terms. However, a representative of the Registrar’s Office shall serve as an ex-officio member.

3. The Undergraduate Programs Committee has the responsibility to review proposals for modifications, additions or terminations of programs. The Committee shall forward such proposals to the Council, recommending either approval or disapproval. All proposals for changes in programs approved by the Council shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as policy recommendations.

4. The Undergraduate Programs Committee shall meet at the call of the Committee Chairperson.

5. Procedure of the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall be as follows:
   
   a. University proposals related to curriculum changes that come to the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall be divided by the Chairperson into the following three classes:

   (1) Class 1 - proposals for program modification that involve only minor changes such as wording of program titles or program description.

   (2) Class 2 - proposals that request substantive changes in programs already in existence. Substantive changes include changes in credit hours, program content, and program requirements.

   (3) Class 3 - proposals that request new programs, propose elimination of existing programs, and all proposals concerning additions or modifications that seem significantly to involve more than one College or School of the University, including interdisciplinary minors whose program requirements draw from more than one College/School.

   b. The various classes shall then be handled as follows:

   (1) Class 1 - The Committee Chairperson may approve them, or submit them to the Undergraduate Programs Committee for action.
(2) Class 2 - The Committee Chairperson may use campus mail, e-mail, and/or telephone conversations to determine whether a majority of the Committee approves the proposal in question, or submit such proposals at a meeting of the Undergraduate Programs Committee.

(3) Class 3 - The Committee Chairperson must submit such proposals to the Undergraduate Programs Committee at a meeting open to all University students, staff, and faculty. Whenever such a proposal is to be considered by the Undergraduate Programs Committee, the Chairperson shall give advance notice to Chairpersons of those departments whose proposals are to be considered.

6. Proposals that concern the addition of undergraduate programs shall be routed as follows:

   a. Originated by the individual faculty members who desire to offer the program;
   
   b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Department;
   
   c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the College or School;
   
   d. Reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Programs Committee of the Curriculum Council, as appropriate;
   
   e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;
   
   f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;
   
   g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost to be reviewed for conformance to institutional priorities and mission.

7. Justification for new programs: The proposal for each new program shall include the Form 92 and the New Program Request Form (required format for submission to Illinois Board of Higher Education) with statements providing rationale for the program, evidence of communication with other Departments, Colleges, or Schools that might be interested in the program, and evidence of consultation or consultation with any other Colleges or Schools with which the program subject matter overlaps.

8. Proposals that concern the modification or termination of undergraduate programs shall be routed as follows:

   a. Originated by the individual faculty members or department concerned;
   
   b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Department;
   
   c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the College or School;
d. Reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Programs Committee of the Curriculum Council, as appropriate;

e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;

f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;

g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost for further review.

9. Justification for modified or terminated program: The proposal for each modified or terminated program should include the proper form, a Reasonable and Moderate Extension (RME) if necessary, a description of the program as modified, a listing of all changes, a list of associated Forms 90, and a rationale for the changes.

B. Undergraduate Courses Committee (UCC)

1. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Courses Committee shall be appointed from the Council members by the Council Chairperson with the approval of a majority of the Council. The term of office shall be one year; the same chairperson may not serve more than three successive terms.

2. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Courses Committee shall appoint at least five additional members to the Committee, ensuring a simple majority of faculty is always present. Appointed faculty members need not be on the Curriculum Council. These appointments shall be approved by a majority of the Council. The term of Committee members shall be one year; they may succeed themselves, but cannot hold more than three consecutive terms. However, a representative of the Registrar’s Office shall serve as an ex-officio member.

3. The Undergraduate Courses Committee has the responsibility to review proposals for revision, additions, and terminations of undergraduate courses. The Committee shall act on these matters with the approval of the Curriculum Council, and call to the attention of the Council any proposed changes.

4. The Undergraduate Courses Committee shall meet at the call of the Committee Chair.

5. Procedures of the Undergraduate Courses Committee shall be as follows:

a. The primary responsibility of the Undergraduate Courses Committee is to review proposals for new courses (Form 90A) or experimental courses.

(1) Major modifications to courses (Form 90C), which require Undergraduate Courses Committee approval, include major change in course description, level of instruction, change in pre-or co-requisites, cross-listed course status, or other modifications that the Undergraduate Courses Committee Chair determined substantially change the course.
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(2) Modifications to courses (Form 90C) that impact the status of the course with respect to the General Education requirements shall be forwarded to the General Education Committee.

(3) Modifications to courses (Form 90C) that impact a department's senior assignment shall be forwarded to the Committee on Assessment.

(4) Elimination of courses (Form 90B) requires consideration by the Undergraduate Courses Committee.

b. The Committee Chairperson may call a meeting or may use campus mail, email, and/or telephone conversations to determine whether a majority of the committee approves the proposal in question.

6. Proposals that concern the addition, modification, or elimination of undergraduate courses shall be routed as follows:

a. Originated by the individual faculty members or department concerned;

b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Department;

c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the College or School;

d. Reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Courses Committee of the Curriculum Council, as appropriate;

e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;

f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;

g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost for further review.

7. Justification for new courses:

a. The application for each new course shall include the Form 90A, a syllabus for the course, a short statement concerning the need for the course, evidence of communication with members of any other departments who might be interested in the course, and evidence of collusion or consultation, if the course is cross-listed or if the subject matter is similar to, or possibly overlaps, that of another discipline.

b. Applications for course modifications require only the Form 90C, a syllabus for the course, and a brief statement justifying the change.
c. Applications to change an experimental course to a regular course must be accompanied by a brief statement concerning the success of the course and a description of the process used to evaluate it.

C. The General Education Committee

1. The voting members of the Committee shall be as follows: Nine faculty members, four from CAS, one from each of the other schools with a baccalaureate program, and one faculty member from Library and Information Services (staggered three-year terms). Two undergraduate students (one-year term), appointed by the Student Senate. The Director of General Education (or designated representative).

2. The non-voting members of the Committee (with indefinite terms) shall be as follows: the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or delegated representative), the Director of Academic Advising (or delegated representative), the University Registrar (or delegated representative), the Director of Assessment (or delegated representative), the Associate Dean of CAS in charge of scheduling.

3. The method of selection of the faculty members of the Committee shall be as follows:

   a. During the Spring term, the Dean of each School or College will appoint the required number of members and alternates.

   b. The candidates shall be presented for confirmation by the Curriculum Council and the Senate at their April meetings.

   c. For all faculty members, service on General Education Committee is for a three-year term commencing August 15th. Vacancies created in the middle of a term by resignation or inability to serve shall be filled by appointment of one of the designated alternates of the General Education Committee by the Chair of the General Education Committee until the following Spring Semester, at which time the vacancy shall be filled according to the procedure in 3. a.

4. During the Spring term, a voting member on the General Education Committee shall be designated Chair by the President of the Faculty Senate and the Chair of the Curriculum Council (whose terms begin in April of that Spring term). This selection shall be presented for confirmation by the Curriculum Council and the Senate at the same time as the slate of proposed new members of the General Education Committee. The Chair shall serve for one year and may succeed himself/herself twice.

5. In meetings of the General Education Committee, the Chair shall only vote in case of a tie. The responsibilities of the Chair shall be as follows:

   a. To serve as the official representative of General Education Committee as a voting member of the Curriculum Council,
b. To call meetings of the Committee (at least once per term) for the timely consideration of such matters as shall have been submitted to it;

c. To enact the Committee’s oversight (see below) of the General Education Program,

6. A Secretary of the General Education Committee shall be appointed by the Chair from among the membership of the General Education Committee. The secretary shall serve for one year, and shall have the following responsibilities:

   a. To keep accurate minutes of all meetings of the General Education Committee;

   b. To assist the Governance Office in the maintenance of the records of the General Education Committee’s activities.

7. The General Education Committee shall meet at the call of its Chairperson. A quorum of the Committee shall be six (6)-voting members, including the Chairperson.

8. The General Education Committee bears the primary responsibility for maintaining and developing the General Education Program at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. Its responsibilities include the following:

   a. To review proposals for additions, terminations, and modification of all general education courses and requirements.

   b. To review proposed modifications in the General Education program and/or requirements, and to recommend them as appropriate.

   c. To advise the Director of General Education concerning scheduling and content of General Education courses, and to recommend changes in the scheduling or content of courses where appropriate.

   d. To advise the Director of General Education about the need for additional courses.

   e. To consider requests from students concerning general education requirements.

   f. To consider any other matters that the General Education Committee believes essential to the continued success of General Education at the University, and to recommend appropriate actions.

   g. To place any General Education course or requirements that the General Education Committee deems deficient in satisfying the goals established for the relevant General Education components on probationary status for one year. If the department or unit is unable to make satisfactory amendments to the course, project, or activity, the General Education Committee, in consultation with the
Faculty Senate

Provost and Director of General Education, has the authority to remove the course, project, or activity from the General Education Program.

9. All decisions of the General Education Committee are subject to review and approval by the Curriculum Council.

10. Procedures of the General Education Committee shall be as follows:
   a. All proposals for the addition of general education courses shall be circulated to members one week prior to the meeting at which it is considered.
   b. Representatives of the proposing Department(s), College or School(s) shall be invited to meet with the General Education Committee during the discussion portion of deliberations relating to their proposal and respond to proposed modifications.

11. Requests to propose, modify, or delete general education courses shall be routed in the following sequence:
   a. Originated by the individual faculty members who desire to teach the course (or by departments in cases where the General Education Committee has requested the course);
   b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee(s) of the Department(s) involved;
   c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee(s) of the College or School(s) involved;
   d. Reviewed and approved by the General Education Committee, as appropriate (If course cannot be considered by the General Education Committee until the course is approved by at least two different departments within the College of Arts and Sciences, by CAS and one other School, or by two different Schools);
   e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;
   f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;
   g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost for further review.

12. The General Education Committee shall have responsibility for the continuing review of the General Education program. Responsibilities include:
   a. To begin a continuous review of the General Education program starting three years after students matriculate under any requirement of the new General Education program approved by the Faculty Senate in 2007-2008. The review
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shall be done annually in such a way that it is completed at the end of five years, when the review process shall begin again.

b. To review, in a manner determined by the Curriculum Council, the General Education program on an annual basis, with "Foundations" courses to be reviewed in the first year, "Breadth" courses in the second and third years, and "Interdisciplinary Studies" courses along with other general education requirements in the fourth year. The fifth year in the cycle shall be devoted to reviewing the entire program from a holistic and comprehensive perspective. Each year, the Committee may be augmented with additional members as needed to help with the review. These members shall be eligible to vote on Committee decisions and will serve one-year terms. They may succeed themselves, but cannot hold more than three consecutive terms.

c. To place all courses that are not re-approved in the General Education Committee's annual review on probationary status. Departments will have one year to address satisfactorily the Committee's concerns; otherwise, such courses will be removed from the list of courses approved for General Education credit.

d. To prepare materials in support of both the annual review of undergraduate education reported through the Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP) process and any special reviews of General Education that the University shall undertake.

e. To participate with the Office of Institutional Research and Studies in any regular inventories it conducts that shall result in data pertinent to the evaluation of the General Education Program.

D. Academic Standards and Policies Committee

1. The Chairperson of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee shall be appointed from the Council members by the Council Chairperson with the approval of the majority of the Council. The term of office shall be for one year; Chairpersons may succeed themselves, but cannot serve more than three successive terms.

2. The Chairperson of Academic Standards and Policies Committee shall appoint at least three additional members to the Committee, ensuring a simple majority of faculty is always present. These appointments shall be approved by a majority of the Council. The term of office shall be one year; the same member may not serve more than three successive terms. However, a representative of the Registrar’s Office shall serve as an ex officio member.

3. The Chairperson of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee shall serve as a liaison to other committees within the University, which deal with academic standards and policies (for example, Graduate Council, Student Task Force, Textbook Services Advisory Committee).
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4. The Academic Standards and Policies Committee has the following responsibilities: to review existing standards and policies (such as grading, suspension, admission, adding and dropping classes); to recommend changes in existing standards and policies for the purpose of improving the quality of instruction.

E. Graduation Appeals Committee (GA)

1. A member of the University Registrar's staff shall serve as the non-voting Chairperson of the Graduation Appeals Committee.

2. In addition to the Chairperson, the Committee shall include three members of the faculty appointed annually by the Committee Chairperson and approved by the Curriculum Council. Committee members may succeed themselves, but may not serve for more than three consecutive terms.

3. For liaison purposes, a member of the Curriculum Council shall be appointed by the Chair of the Curriculum Council to serve as a non-voting member of the Graduation Appeals Committee. This appointment is for three years; reappointment is permitted.

4. The Graduation Appeals Committee shall hear appeals from undergraduate students who seek exceptions to the University general graduation requirements in order to graduate, and shall render decisions in such cases.

5. The Graduation Appeals Committee shall report to the Curriculum Council annually, via the Curriculum Council liaison.

F. Director of Assessment

1. The Director of Assessment shall be selected and approved by the Provost, only from among those names submitted by a Search Advisory Committee. The Search Advisory Committee shall consist of five faculty members, including the Committee Chairperson, appointed by the Curriculum Council in consultation with the Provost. The Search Advisory Committee shall submit the names of at least two acceptable applicants to the Provost, or meet with the Provost if it determines that fewer than two applicants are acceptable to the Committee. The term of office of the Director of Assessment shall be three years and the Director may serve no more than three successive terms. The Director is eligible for reappointment by the Provost pending recommendation from the Curriculum Council.

2. The Director shall serve as an ad hoc member of the Curriculum Council and shall be a voting member of the Council.

3. The Director is responsible for serving as a liaison with departments and programs that seek and maintain specialized accreditation, overseeing, guiding, and facilitating the annual assessment reporting process, managing and maintaining a record of current assessment plans for undergraduate and graduate programs, and offering faculty development training on assessment processes as well as assessment reporting workshops for new program directors and chairs.
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Director is responsible for making recommendations to the Curriculum Council on the basis of these duties. The Director is also responsible for assisting the Committee on Assessment in implementing the Assessment Plan.

4. Regarding the program review process, the duties of the Director shall be:

a. Direct program review for the purpose of assessing program quality and identifying areas that need improvement.

b. Prepare the necessary instruments for obtaining data from the program director, the faculty, current students, and recent graduates.

c. Set the timetable and deadlines for completion of reviews.

d. Select members for review committees.

e. Conduct orientation meetings for program review committees.

f. Meet with program director and faculty of departments being reviewed to discuss review process and outline steps for completing a self-study.

g. Work closely with program directors to ensure maximum departmental involvement in the review process.

h. Screen and hire applicants for graduate assistants and/or student workers.

i. Supervise activities of graduate assistants and/or student workers.

j. Serve as a liaison between reviewers and programs under review.

k. Set up schedule for interviews of faculty and students in cooperation with the program director.

l. Reproduce and distribute completed departmental self-studies to review committees.

m. Direct the completion of program review reports from the review committees.

n. Present completed reports to the Curriculum Council for approval.

o. Submit reports to the Provost for review and action, as necessary.

p. Serve as liaison to the Office of the Provost.
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q. Work in consultation with the Curriculum Council, the Committee on Assessment, the General Education Committee, and the Director of General Education to coordinate the assessment of the General Education Program.

5. The Director is responsible for assisting the Committee on Assessment in implementing the SIUE Assessment Plan. The duties of the Director shall be to serve as ex-officio member of the Committee on Assessment, and to assist the Committee on Assessment in its charge.

G. Committee on Assessment

1. The functions of the Committee on Assessment include:
   a. Implementing the University Assessment Plan.
   b. Making further policy recommendations that may arise in the implementation process to the Curriculum Council.
   c. Maintaining the Assessment and Senior Assignment Programs.
   d. Approving undergraduate program assessment plans.
   e. Approving changes to undergraduate program assessment plans and/or related courses.
   f. Making recommendations to the Curriculum Council as warranted by the findings of assessment activities.
   g. Consulting with the Director of General Education, Director of Assessment, and the Office of the Provost regarding general education assessment.

2. Membership
   a. Members of the Committee on Assessment shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Provost.
   b. The Committee on Assessment shall be constituted of eight faculty members, one of whom will be a liaison from the Curriculum Council, two undergraduate students, and one representative from each of the following: the Office of Institutional Research, the Director of Assessment, the Associate Provost for Academic Planning, Assessment, and Accreditation, Learning Support Services, and the Academic Deans.
   c. Appointments to the Committee shall normally be for three-year terms; reappointment is permitted for a maximum of three successive terms. All members of the Committee are voting members.
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d. The Chairperson of the Committee shall be appointed from among the Committee membership, by the Faculty Senate President in consultation with the Provost. The term of office as Chairperson shall be one year; reappointment of the same individual to additional terms is permitted indefinitely.

H. Director of General Education

1. The Director of General Education shall be selected and approved by the Provost, only from among those names submitted by a Search Advisory Committee. The Search Advisory Committee shall consist of five faculty members, including the Committee Chairperson, appointed by the Curriculum Council in consultation with the Provost. The Search Advisory Committee shall submit the names of at least two acceptable applicants to the Provost, or meet with the Provost if it determines that fewer than two applicants are acceptable to the Committee. The term of office of the Director of General Education shall be three years and the Director may serve no more than three successive terms. The Director is eligible for reappointment by the Provost pending recommendation from the Curriculum Council.

2. The Director shall serve as a voting member of the Curriculum Council and the General Education Committee.

3. The Director has administrative responsibility for the effective functioning of the General Education program, including the First Semester Transition Course and IS courses, to ensure high quality offerings and achievement of purpose.

4. The Director shall communicate to departments the need for additional courses deemed necessary to the General Education curriculum.

5. The Director shall assist and advise the General Education Committee in their work.

6. The Director will work, in consultation with the Curriculum Council, the Committee on Assessment, the General Education Committee, and the Director of Assessment, to coordinate the assessment of the General Education program.

VI. Ad Hoc Committees

The Chair of the Council may from time to time create ad hoc committees with the approval of the Council. The nature of the Committees, their duties, estimated life, and the voting status of the Chairpersons of these committees shall all be subject to approval by the Council.

VII. Amendment Recommendations

Recommended amendments to the Operating Papers may be made by two-thirds of Council members present and are subject to approval by the Faculty Senate. Previous notice of the proposed amendment(s) must have been circulated to members one week prior to the meeting at which it is considered.
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Approved by the Interim Chancellor November 20, 2015
Approved by Faculty Senate October 1, 2015 (CC#01-15/16)

Approved by the Chancellor December 16, 2013
Approved by Faculty Senate November 7, 2013 (CC#20-13/14)
Approved by the Chancellor January 24, 2013
Approved by Faculty Senate December 6, 2012 (CC#11-12/13)

Approved by Curriculum Council 01/20/11
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Proposed Update to SIUE University Policy 1E1

The office of Graduate and International Admissions proposes two changes to SIUE’s Admission Policy (1E1) relating to international students:

1. The first change is to lower the required test scores needed to demonstrate sufficient English Proficiency for undergraduate students only. (Requirements for new graduate students would remain the same.) This change is reflected below in Section 4.1.
2. The second change is to allow for students to be admitted to the university for the purpose of enrolling in the Intensive English Language Program on the SIUE campus, which was recently approved by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement under the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. This change is reflected in Section 4.7.8.

The remaining changes noted below are intended to simply clean up the existing language to appropriately reflect any changes that have occurred since the current policy was established.

E. International Students

1. Students Holding or Requiring Student Visas

Applicants are expected to satisfy appropriate academic requirements, demonstrate English language proficiency, and provide acceptable evidence of adequate financial resources. Applicants with US educational credentials will be reviewed for academic eligibility under the same standards applied to domestic students. Standard reference materials published by recognized organizations such as (but not limited to) the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and NASPA. Association of International Educators will be used as general guidelines to evaluate foreign academic credentials for academic eligibility, level of placement, and acceptability of transfer credit. In individual cases, appropriate faculty will be consulted for clarification of student credentials.

Applicants whose recognized first language is not English must provide acceptable verification of their English language proficiency.

Verification must be on file by the appropriate application deadline. Details are found under the heading “Students Whose First Language Is Not English.”

All applicants requiring a student visa must submit proof of adequate financial resources to the Office of Admissions in advance of admission. A financial certificate and instructions for its completion are included in the application packet. Financial arrangements must be approved by the appropriate deadline. Questions regarding financial matters should be directed to the Office of International Admissions.

The Office of International Admissions will change the deadlines as needed.

Sections 2 & 3 - No Changes

4. Applicants Whose First Language Is Not English

All applicants with study authorized visas and/or foreign academic credentials whose first language is not English must demonstrate adequate English language proficiency in advance of admission. English language proficiency must be verified in one of the following ways:

1. Applicants may sit for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), or the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and have an official score report sent directly to Admissions. The minimum acceptable score for admission to a graduate program is a TOEFL score of 79 (IBT) or IELTS score of 6.5. For undergraduate admission the minimum score required is a TOEFL score of 72 (IBT) or an overall IELTS score of 6.0 with no individual component score of less than 5.5. Applicants may submit scores from another
recognized testing service as long as the scores can be documented as being equal to or greater than the required IELTS or TOEFL score.

2. Applicants may submit a properly certified copy of their General Certificate of Education administered by a British Testing Agency showing a grade of A, B, or C in the subject English Language. Recognized equivalent examinations will also be considered.

3. Applicants may submit academic records certifying that they have graduated from a recognized secondary school, college or university where English is the exclusive language of instruction and is located in a primarily English-speaking country. A list of SIUE approved countries is posted on the International Admissions website. Requests to add the list of countries will be reviewed by the Office of the Provost.

4. Applicants may submit academic records certifying that they have completed courses totaling at least 6 semester hours, equivalent to both English 101 (English Composition I) and English 102 (English Composition II) with earned grades of "C" or better at a regionally accredited college or university in the United States.

5. Applicants may sit for University-administered placement tests and meet internally indicated indicators of college entry level competence in English and reading.

6. Applicants may submit a certificate or documentation from an authorized Intensive English Language Program (IELP) that certifies English language proficiency equivalent to a minimum TOEFL or IELTS score as indicated in section 4.4.

7. Applicants who meet all other requirements for admission but cannot demonstrate adequate English language proficiency may receive conditional admission either as an undeclared undergraduate student or to a graduate academic program and be admitted to the university for the purpose of enrolling in the Intensive English Language (IELP) curriculum and academic development coursework only. Admission to the IELP will be authorized by the IPP Director and the Office of International Admissions based on criteria posted on the International Admissions website. Successful completion of the SIUE Intensive English Program will satisfy the English proficiency requirement of the university, allowing the student to advance to degree seeking status. This admission provision may be authorized for two academic terms with 1 time extension authorized by International Admissions for undergraduate students and by individual departmental deans for graduate students.

8. Applicants may submit an ACT sub-scores of 21 or greater in Reading and English, or an SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing sub-score of 530.
IBHE-FAC report for the SIUE Faculty Senate meeting on 2 April 2020

The IBHE-FAC did not meet as a whole in March. Caucuses and Working Groups met on 20 March 2020 via Zoom.

The Public Caucus COVID-19 discussion included: concerns about work that cannot be done remotely (e.g. woodshop, animal care) and how that might affect pay and safety; the UPI call for physical closures; grading options; tenure clock issues; citing cancelled conference presentations; technology issues (access for students, making low-bandwidth videos; synchronous versus asynchronous instruction; and what types of refunds might be offered to students and the corresponding impact on university budgets.

Discussion of pending FAC bylaws revisions raised issues related to descriptions of officer duties and also how the Open Meetings Act has an impact on FAC functions. We also discussed the IAIA Statement on Labs ad Oral Communication, the Mental Health Technical Assistance Center, Governor Pritzker’s budget proposal to offer community college tuition-free for families earning under $45,000, and reaccreditation processes.

We are participating in the Mental Health Working Group, which spent meeting time building a shared document focused on our concerns related to the implementation of the law. Our document will focus on aspects that legislators might affect, although some other issues have also been raised.

The next IBHE-FAC was scheduled for April 17th, but is currently TBD; if it happens, it will probably be via Zoom.

With regards, Susan D. Wiediger, representative, and Shelly Goebl-Parker, alternate representative, for SIUE to the IBHE-FAC. For more information about any of these items, please contact us via email at swiedip@siue.edu or egoeblp@siue.edu respectively.
Curriculum Council Report, March 2020


The Council unanimously approved proposed changes to University Admission Policy 1E1, specifically policies pertaining to International Students. The proposed changes include lowering the required test scores needed to demonstrate sufficient English Proficiency for undergraduate students only. (Requirements for new graduate students would remain the same.) This change was based on admission requirements for other Illinois Universities and peer institutions. The second change is to allow for students to be admitted to the university for the purpose of enrolling in the Intensive English Language Program on the SIUE campus, which was recently approved by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement under the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The Council discussed changes to its leadership for AY2020-2021. Keith Hecht agreed to serve as Council Chair and John Foster and Kathy Brady agreed to continue to serve at Undergraduate Programs Committee Chair and Secretary, respectively.

Program reviews included additional discussion of two CAS programs including Mass Communications and Economics. Both were unanimously rated in Good Standing with enrollments Sustainable at Current Levels.
Rules & Procedures Council (RPC) Report

Chair: Wai Hsien Cheah

4/2/20

The CHAPA summary report has been written and was sent to the Chancellor for comment. Once the document is approved by the Chancellor, this report will be shared with Faculty Senate.

RPC is currently working on the Provost’s annual evaluation report. The election process for the two at-large memberships of Graduate Council will be carried out shortly.

As Chair-Elect, Dr. Ezra Temko has agreed to serve as the Chair of the Rules and Procedures Council for academic calendar year 2020-2021.
Monday, March 2, 2020

Dr. Randy Pembroke
Rendleman Hall 3316
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Edwardsville, IL 62026

Dear Chancellor Pembroke,

As described in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the Rules and Procedures Council has completed the annual evaluation of the Chancellor.

According to the Rules and Procedures Council’s operating papers, we invite you to respond within ten working days either in writing or through discussion with the Chair of the Council; once we receive your response, the report will be finalized and resubmitted to you. Upon final approval, the report will be shared with the faculty senate.

The final report consists of the following:
1. Cover letter with summarized statement from the Rules and Procedures Council
2. Sample qualitative data organized by major themes
3. Quantitative Data
4. Chancellor’s Response
5. Raw data

Sections 1-4, once approved, will be shared with the Faculty Senate, and then the full report will be stored in the University Archives for permanent retention.

Please feel free to contact the Chair if you have any questions or concerns regarding this evaluation report.

Sincerely,

Wai Hsien Cheah  Chair, Rules and Procedures Council  wcheah@siue.edu
Marcus Agusti  Evaluations Sub-Committee, Mathematics & Statistics  magusti@siue.edu
Vincent Rapini  Evaluations Sub-Committee, School of Dental Medicine  vrapini@siue.edu
James Hanlon  Geography  jhanlon@siue.edu
Andrzej Lozowski  Electrical & Computer Engineering  alozowski@siue.edu
Ezra Temko  Sociology  etemko@siue.edu
Jared Sheley  School of Pharmacy  jashele@siue.edu
Section 1: Summarized Report from Rules and Procedures Council

To: Randy Pembroke, Chancellor
Re: Final Summary Report

Chancellor Pembroke:

The summarized report below is based on survey responses and open-ended comments. This report addresses data from four main areas including academic leadership, service leadership, communication, and decision making. It also includes several open-ended questions. The ranking system was a 1.0 – 5.0 scale with 1 being poor, 2 fair, 3 neutral, 4 good, and 5 excellent. Therefore, based on this year’s ranking system, the highest numerical data is associated with the highest rating.

Out of 525 voting faculty members, 140 responded to this survey, for a total response rate of approximately 27% (an increased of 5% from last year).

Your scores averaged 3.67 (Neutral to Good) overall, with a standard deviation of 1.38. Your highest scores were in providing substantive community service and leadership \((M = 4.06)\), communicating prioritized goals for the University \((M = 3.90)\), interacting with the University community on all issues of interest on a regular and open basis \((M = 3.88)\), strengthening relationships and partnership between the University and state, national and international organizations \((M = 3.84)\), and fostering open dialogue and consensus building with external constituencies \((M = 3.84)\), and with students, faculty, and staff on campus \((M = 3.83)\).

Your lowest scores highlight some areas for improvement. These include your judgment in selecting effective administrators in advancing the goals of the University \((M = 3.25)\), ability in successfully raising funds from both public and private sectors \((M = 3.33)\), willingness to make and follow through on commitments in order to provide sufficient support to departments \((M = 3.41)\), optimally manages fiscal resources \((M = 3.42)\), and the fostering of a working climate conducive to the achievement of faculty goals \((M = 3.45)\). These all cluster towards your decision making on issues of importance to faculty.

Overall, qualitative comments can be summarized in five major areas.

1) Concern about the budget allocation from the SIU system

Overall, the faculty believed that SIUE deserves its fair share of the budget. As a unit of the SIU system, SIUE has sacrificed enough over the years, and therefore, it should be treated equitably. Furthermore, SIUE has performed at a high level while maintaining the rigor of its academic programs, with very little resources from the state and SIU system in past years. Thus, it is now time for SIUE to be treated as equal partners within the SIU system. The faculty asked that the Chancellor be more forceful in his attempts in getting us the fair share of the budget from the SIU system. Given our growth as a higher educational institution, the additional fiscal resources will be very much needed.

2) Improve faculty morale and increase faculty salary

As highlighted by the faculty, low faculty morale and inequitable salary continue to be issues of concern. After several years without the state budget and with stagnant salaries, coupled with the ever increasing
workload, the overworked, underpaid, and undervalued faculty are asking the Chancellor to find ways to further improve faculty morale and increase faculty salary.

3) **Mend the tarnished faculty-administration relationship**

The Chancellor’s lack of intent and commitment to promote faculty interest during his negotiation with the Faculty Union has resulted in the loss of his credibility. Since the collective bargaining agreement has been realized, it is now time for the Chancellor to put in more effort in mending the “sour” relationship between the administrators and faculty.

4) **The Chancellor needs a stronger administrative team**

With the dwindling state appropriation along with fewer graduating seniors from high schools throughout the state of Illinois, the need for increasing the student body appears to be of highest priority. Academic programs that will match and meet the students’ needs will also be required. To overcome these challenges, the faculty felt that the Chancellor will need a stronger administrative team to advance our institutional prestige, and ultimately achieve the vision, mission, and goals of the university.

5) **Support for the Chancellor’s effort**

Although the Chancellor faced a myriad of challenges in academic calendar year 2019-20, he does have the support from the faculty. The faculty applauded the Chancellor’s commitment in pursuing the betterment of the University. His transparency, his advocacy for the university, his open-communication with the faculty and other constituencies within and beyond SIUE, as well as his willingness to listen to the faculty are to be commended.

The Rules and Procedures Council wishes to be helpful and encouraging in this feedback and thanks you for your courtesies. Per Senate policy, you have ten working days to officially respond. Please do not hesitate to contact me directly if you require additional information, or have questions, I am eager to be of service.

Sincerely,

Rules & Procedures Council, Chairperson
Section 2: Sample qualitative data organized by major themes

Concern about the budget allocation from the SIU system

- The reallocation of how funding is split between SIUC and SIUE is the most pressing concern. For too long, we at SIUE have been performing at a high level with less resources than SIUC. We have been proactive about belt tightening for years while maintaining high standards and it is leading to burn out. There are great faculty and staff here that are overextending themselves in ways that are not fair to them or their students. Please advocate more forcefully for reallocation.

- Funding allocation by the state. We need the Chancellor's leadership in getting the new President to be on board with the issue, and ultimately work with the President to get SIUE a fairer pot of the money.

- Budget allocation at the system level - needs to be a fair and equitable formula. The university needs to be flexible and able to move quickly to get items accomplished - in the next decade plus fewer students will be graduating high school, reducing the numbers of students that might come to SIUE. The best thing we can do right now is position ourselves to be flexible and inventive enough to survive lower enrollments in the future.

- We need to continue with the momentum garnered with all of our successes. We need to continue to be positive, but again I worry that if something is not done for equity, then there could be some consequences regarding faculty strikes. We deserve to be compensated fairly and equally especially with all that we do on such a limited funding model. Please use your negotiations and connections with anyone who will listen to make the funding allocation more equal!

- Our allocation in comparison to Carbondale is not changing. The Chancellor is not able to assist in our push for fair funding and this is weakening our efforts. Our enrollment decline should have us springing into action to demand better funding and to continue to innovate. The Chancellor seems content to pass along generalized cuts, which bite into morale for staff and faculty too.

Improve faculty morale and increase faculty salary

- Aside from pressing the BoT on the allocation issues, salary compression has the potential to be a powder-keg issue. In some schools (e.g., SEHHB), new hires are receiving base salaries equal to or higher than faculty with more time and rank. If salaries are not adjusted quickly, faculty morale will take yet another hit.

- Exhaustion! The faculty I work with every day make it clear that I am not the only one discouraged by the ever-increasing workload that we all bear. The budget cuts that began nearly ten years ago with Rauner have stripped us to the bone. We have lost two and a half staff positions, three faculty positions and a number of graduate assistantships. That means that the 100 hours of staff work each week, the 30 hours of service provided by lost faculty and the 50+ hours lost through graduate assistantships are all hours that have been spread onto the duties of the remaining faculty.
• Rebuilding faculty morale after several years without a state budget, stagnant salaries, hiring freezes, and a protracted contract negotiation. Faculty are the face of this institution to our students and many of us still feel overworked, underpaid, and invisible during discussions of the future of this university.

• Improving faculty morale through the advancement of our institutional prestige as not only a premier teaching institution but also a research university.

• Morale among faculty is low. All we're ever asked to do is teach more and bring in students. Recognition of our efforts, and a bit of a personal connection, would go a long way.

• Adequate resources to fully realize the Collective Bargaining Agreement. We are being told that I'm CAS we need to define our overloads as not overloads because we need to “work within the existing budget”. I work in a department that has been given $0 in the past “equity“ pay and morale is really suffering. We are continually being asked to do more with less and are really becoming demoralized.

• Faculty are being underpaid and devalued. A university can not thrive without good faculty. Without well respected and appreciated faculty a university is not a center of education and counter to what our Chancellor seems to think, student enrollment will continue to decrease if the classroom experience is poor.

• Obtaining sufficient finances that will make faculty salaries competitive in the overall job market.

• Poor salaries across the board, making hiring and retention difficult and the impact of this on students.

• Need more faculty and staff and better pay for all. Answer is in allocation with SIUC. We have got to stop financing SIUC on the backs of overworked, underpaid faculty and staff.

Mend the tarnished faculty-administration relationship

• Working better with faculty.

• The administration working in a more collegial manner with faculty who do the work of the university--educate. Could show more respect for how hard faculty work. Could work more to reverse the discrepancies in compensation between women and men on campus and between minority and majority faculty. This would be more meaningful that "strategic goals." Chose actions instead.

• I do not have a strong opinion on this, but I have colleagues who think the Chancellor is anti-faculty. True or not, I imagine this is not a reputation he would embrace.

• How to lead faculty when he has lost all credibility due to terrible collective bargaining.

• The Chancellor is a poor leader and does not have the interests of the faculty in mind.

• Faculty-admin relations. These were absolutely gutted during negotiations and faculty still do not trust the Chancellor. The Chancellor also needs to get his Vice Chancellors under control. They are not following policies, and frankly, Rachel Stack is losing us money by being difficult to work with.
The Chancellor needs a stronger administrative team

- A strata of weak administrators (Provost, Graduate Dean) who have been ineffective at fixing problems on campus. It's not clear whether this is their fault or the Chancellor's (although re: the Graduate Dean, he's been ineffective through multiple Chancellors).

- Ongoing budget issues and hiring the "best" qualified personnel for higher level administrative positions.

- There are a few people in administration whose actions do not reflect the Chancellor's goals for the university.

- University Advancement and Foundation office is in complete disarray for the last three years and nothing has been done about it. The leadership in that office is completely dysfunctional. All major gifts came through without their noteworthy involvement.

- The Chancellor is doing what he can overall. He needs to "shake up" the Provost Office. This is the office that needs new blood in most positions.

- Finding a better Provost for our university.

Support for the Chancellor's effort

- The financial allocation discussions - I think the Chancellor has done a great job advocating and it is frustrating how the Board is not actually addressing the issue despite the pressure. I applaud the efforts and want to encourage us to keep focused on it.

- The Chancellor has been transparent with regards to informing the university on how external forces have impacted SIUE (e.g., budget, what is going on in Springfield). As a faculty, I appreciate his effort to communicate the various initiatives being undertaken.

- SIUE is extremely fortunate to have a chancellor who understands the campus and its potential as well as Randy Pembrook does. He is not perfect, but he is the best chancellor we've had in 20 years.

- I think the Chancellor has done a good job representing the university and inspires some confidence amongst the faculty that we will manage. The Chancellor is very transparent and genuinely has the best interests of the university, students, faculty, and staff at heart.

- I am extremely satisfied with the Chancellor's performance. He is very open to feedback from faculty and is working in a very effective manner. I was ready to look for employment elsewhere, to be honest, but after speaking to Dr. Randy Pembrook on several occasions, I see a much brighter future for SIUE.

- I think this Chancellor has a good heart.
## Section 3: Quantitative Data

1. General Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic leadership (allocating resources for faculty in a manner promoting excellence in teaching, research, and service)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service leadership (fostering an institutional climate conducive to achievement of University goals and mission)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication (interacting on regular and open basis with the University community on all issues of interest)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decision making (identifying, understanding, and addressing issues of significance to the University)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Keeps abreast of changes in education and the need for new programs in the University</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic leadership (allocating resources for faculty in a manner promoting excellence in teaching, research, and service)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service leadership (fostering an institutional climate conducive to achievement of University goals and mission)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication (interacting on regular and open basis with the University community on all issues of interest)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decision making (identifying, understanding, and addressing issues of significance to the University)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Keeps abreast of changes in education and the need for new programs in the University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Effectively communicates prioritized goals for the University</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrates a commitment to collegial governance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspires confidence in approach to decision-making</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fosters positive morale by establishing a working climate conducive to the achievement of faculty goals</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Optimally manages fiscal resources</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Specific Performance Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Effectively promotes minority participation in the University community</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides substantive community service and leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shows an understanding of the mission and academic goals of departments</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Willing to make and follow through on commitments in order to provide sufficient support to departments</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The strategic planning in serving the development and mission of the University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The vision, integrity, and the leadership skills in engaging</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the campus community in maintaining the highest standards of quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and academic excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Judgment in selecting effective administrators in advancing the</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goals of the University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actions in fostering open dialogue and consensus building with</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students, faculty, and staff on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Actions in fostering open dialogue and consensus building with</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>external constituencies such as alumni, state and federal officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and agencies, the media, and community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Actions in strengthening relationships and partnership between the</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University and state, national and international organizations, both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public and private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The vision, integrity, and the leadership skills in engaging the</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campus community in maintaining the highest standards of quality and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Judgment in selecting effective administrators in advancing the goals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actions in fostering open dialogue and consensus building with students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, faculty, and staff on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Actions in fostering open dialogue and consensus building with external</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constituencies such as alumni, state and federal officials and agencies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the media, and community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Actions in strengthening relationships and partnership between the</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University and state, national and international organizations, both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public and private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Additional Job Specific Performance Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ability in successfully raising funds from both public and private</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Competence in contemporary administrative and organizational concepts</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Competence in educational planning and evaluation procedures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Competence in promoting the utilization of new technologies to deliver</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Chancellor’s Response

Thank you for the survey information from March 2nd. I have the following thoughts in response:

1. First, thank you for conducting this process each year. I know it takes a great deal of time and effort and the information is helpful to me as I think about SIUE and our future efforts. This year, in particular, the feedback will be helpful within the larger 4-year evaluation data included as part of CHAPA. I appreciate the opportunity for this feedback to be part of my discussions with President Mahony on many of the issues addressed in the evaluation.

2. The largest concern continues to be the budget overall and how that is affected by key elements such as the State Appropriation, the System Allocation, and Enrollment among others. I know this is an issue that has been discussed in many SIUE settings and I would welcome the chance to discuss it with the Rules and Procedures Council and/or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. It is a key element in SIUE’s future and pertains to other major decisions such as the Doctoral-Professional/R2 review occurring on campus. It also directly relates to faculty and staff morale, another major theme in the annual evaluation.

3. Staffing within the Foundation and the adjustments required so that the Foundation is in a stronger position to help individuals at SIUE (including Development Directors, Chancellor’s Council members, Deans and others) is a topic that we have addressed in several ways in the past two months. I would like to share some of this information with you.

4. Thank you for sharing section five which contained positive statements relating to transparency, advocacy, and open communication. There are many challenges in serving as the Chancellor. We will not always agree on choices and directions but I appreciate the comments about my efforts to share with the campus. The faculty/staff lunches are a new approach that have worked well this year in providing an opportunity for those attending to voice concerns as well as underscore current strengths of SIUE. I thought the comments about changing the format for the campus-wide Q&As to include more small group conversations (e.g., with Departments and Schools) to be an idea worth trying in 2020-2021.

5. Now that the Faculty Association agreement has been ratified and we have spent several months trying to work out some of the details contained in the original agreement, I agree with comments contained in the survey that it would seem to be a good time to investigate ways of healing any hard feelings that may exist from the negotiation process. I would be interested in talking with the Council about effective ways to go about that task.
6. Two specific issues within the survey that also seem to merit further discussion are salary compression and faculty development. Salary compression stems from efforts to increase starting salaries at SIUE, a good thing, but with ripple effects. Faculty and staff development continues to be a topic of discussion and I think the Innovation Grant process may lead to some answers in this venue. I would be happy to discuss these further as the Innovation Grant review moves forward this Spring.
Emails/Calls with Tom Jordan
OMA – virtual meetings are okay now under the Governor’s Executive Order.
Discussion of the grading policy (change to P/F or keep ABCDF).
Sabbatical presentations for Spring are no longer required (can still present them in the Fall if desired)
Maymester and June FfF classes will be “hidden” from student view until it can be determined that these can be moved online, as they are registering for Summer/Fall 2020. We are waiting to make any decisions about July classes.
(W/Mark Poepsel, FA president) Discussion of merit raise vs. across the board raises. The FA will need to vote, as the CBA calls for a merit raise this year.

Constituency Heads Meeting – Zoom
3/25/2020
Chancellor said the leadership “meets” daily at 8 and 3; daily call with the SIU system; call with Illinois Higher Ed every other day
Friday will likely be an email to students about refunds.