

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 27, 2025 – 2:30 pm
Magnolia Room, Morris University Center
Approved Minutes

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was called to order at 2:38 pm on Thursday, February 27, 2025 in the Magnolia Room by President Marcus Agustin.

Present: Marcus Agustin, Wai Cheah, Kevin Cannon, Keith Hecht, Tim Kalinowski, Chrissy Simmons, Cinnamon VanPutte, Amy Winn

Absent: Jon Pettibone

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Consideration of Minutes:

The February 27, 2025 meeting minutes were approved as written.

Announcements:

HLC Accreditation Visit – March 31-April 1

- Focused Session: Shared Governance (**April 1; 9 am Legacy Room**)

Unfinished Business:

- a. Update on approval of Teaching Excellence Award Committee Operating Papers – FDC agreed with the edits given from the Provost's Office, awaiting final approval from Chancellor.
- b. Update on approval to Changes to Policy 1Q8 (Implementation and Administrative Responsibility Policy) – Still waiting on approval from the Provost and Chancellor.
- c. Changes to Governance Council Operating Papers – Still waiting on approval from the Provost and Chancellor.
- d. Retired and Emeriti Faculty Policy – Will bring changes to the policy forward at the next Welfare & Adjudication Council meeting, then to the full Faculty Senate in May.
- e. Council chairs for 2025-2026 – Keith will discuss who wants to be Chair of Welfare & Adjudication Council at his next meeting; Kevin will do the same for the Budget, Finance, and Academic Operations Council. Amy, Tim, and Chrissy are amenable to serving another year as Chair if their Councils elect them.

New Business:

- a. Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) at SIUE – Chrissy Simmons posted her report of the faculty survey on the use of AI at SIUE. The survey was distributed to 625 faculty through Qualtrics. 162 individuals started the survey, and 156 individuals completed it.

General summary of findings: Faculty at SIUE adopt diverse approaches to integrating AI into their disciplines and activities, reflecting varying comfort levels and experiences. With respect to pedagogy, most faculty (81% of respondents) are looking to the administration to adopt a University-wide AI policy. However, some of the concerns expressed by opponents of a formal university AI policy were also echoed by respondents who support having a policy. Of particular interest in the need for a policy that offers flexibility and instructor autonomy to implement the pedagogy of their choosing – with or without AI. The survey asked faculty to align their course(s) on an AI Usage Expectation Level (developed by Jennifer Freiberg at Illinois State University - <https://prodev.illinoisstate.edu/ai/usage/>). Roughly one-third of respondents indicated that they hold the expectation that students will not be using AI in their course. The remaining two-thirds of respondents have varying expectation levels of some AI use (levels 1-6). This result highlights the variability among faculty in defining expectations for AI use in their courses. A University policy would need to encompass this variability and maintain instructor autonomy. Some faculty mentioned having a variety of syllabus statements available to align their courses with AI usage expectations. Roughly 75% of respondents have an AI statement or informal guidelines in their syllabi. Respondents also highlighted the need for an AI policy (or addendum to an existing policy – possibly 116) that identifies student submitted AI-generated work as plagiarism and subject to sanctions as outlined in the Student Code Conduct. In conjunction, such a policy would need to be transparent to both faculty and students.

- b. Program Prioritization: Physics – Amy Winn highlighted the special Curriculum Council meeting that took place directly prior to FSEC today. During the special meeting, Curriculum Council members worked on a memo to leadership illustrating their concerns regarding the proposal, and their recommendations to modify the proposal. Among the Curriculum Council’s recommended modifications for the proposal are: create a merged “Department of Physics & Chemistry” but keep the Physics major and minor”; publicize and emphasize the benefits of a minor in Physics to encourage more STEM majors to pursue this area of study; recommend exploring the School of Engineering as a potential future home for Physics, as it is often the arrangement at other universities.
- c. Syllabi Bank – Dr. Vance McCracken is currently reviewing responses and should get CAS done by early next week. Anticipating having an update to the full Senate next week.

Reports:

UPBC: UPBC held its second meeting of the year on 3/20 and discussed the Physics program prioritization proposal and a change in our operating papers to reduce voting membership to a more manageable and less resource intensive size.

Curriculum Council: Besides the Physics Program Prioritization, working on 1C1 and 1H1.

Governance Council: Surveys are done. One person used co-pilot, while another person didn’t.

President: Spoke with the Chancellor and attended the Physics Program Prioritization open forum. Wish there was more time given for faculty and alumni to talk. Met with Dr. Gupchup. Thank you *all* for your leadership. This has been one of the more difficult times in Faculty Senate.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Submitted by Michael Tadlock-Jackson, University Governance