

## 2017-2018 Graduate Council

### Meeting Minutes

May 3, 2018

**Members Present:** Clay Awsumb, William Babcock, Michael Brown, Wesley Calvert, Norman Carver, Saran Donahoo, Themistoklis Haniotakis, Karen Jones, Sajal Lahiri, Jordan Maddox, Trish McCubbin, Derrick McDowell, Marc Morris, Julie Partridge, Sue Rimmer, Lauran Schaefer, Joseph Shapiro, Jennifer Lynn Smith, Kenneth Stickers, Tomás Velasco, Rachel Whaley.

**Members Absent:** Greg Rose

**Proxies:** Kanako Hayashi for Buffy Ellsworth, Emilia Russo for Sheena Hart, and Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies.

**Ex-Officio:** Lizette Chevalier, Terry Clark, David DiLalla, James Garvey, Meera Komarraju, Carlo Montemagno, James Wall, Juliane Wallace.

**Guests:** Craig Anz, Sara Baer, Mike Eichholz, Derek Fisher, Scott Ishman, Brione Lockett, Mandara Savage.

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:02AM.

### Consideration of Minutes

**M Komarraju** noted that on page 4, her last name was misspelled.

Graduate Council members voted to approve the amended minutes for the meeting held 5 April 2018—21 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstain. The minutes passed.

- **Remarks—President Randy Dunn**

**President Dunn** congratulated everyone on finishing up the year. He then referenced some updates that he had put out in a recent column. The things reported on were the three bills filed in the wake of the reallocation discussion. He thought that everything seems to be on hold in the state house; these bills had not gone beyond committee yet, but he continues to monitor the situation for changes. He then wished to illustrate that while things were on hold, no bill is ever officially dead. He gave as his example Bill 888 which had originally proposed baccalaureate degree authority for community colleges. The bill had some traction this spring after being put on hold the previous spring. He fears that this would open door to an array of baccalaureate degrees offered at community colleges. He then gave an update on recent legislation on the so called “SIU Bills”. He referenced the open letter to SIU written by Amy Sholar, which was perhaps a counterbalance to previous articles. He said the letter illustrates that there is a split in the board at this point. He suggested that some of this discussion needs to play out through the gubernatorial election. He then discussed Student Trustee appointment and concluded his remarks by suggesting the system come together to do the work.

**K Jones** asked if there were word yet for appropriations from the state for the SIU system.

**President Dunn** responded that before fy18, appropriation for the system was \$198 million. Then a 10% cut reduced that to roughly \$179 million. He hoped that at the absolute minimum that \$179 million would remain. He did suggest that some were questioning whether or not there would be a budget at all. He thought most legislators would consider it unwise to leave Springfield in May without a budget. He also suggested that there could be a ramping up of the budget that is put before the governor to see if he would sign it going into the election. He added that he also did not know the future of the “SIU bills”. He

said that the legislature may make some adjustments in allocation between campuses, but he thought that there was a feeling that it is best to leave things alone through the gubernatorial election.

**S Lahiri** asked whether data in the proposal forwarded to the board regarding reallocation went only as far back as 2000. Before that, history goes back for the system to the 1970s. For a long time, SIUC got disproportionately less funding and supported SIUE, and now SIUE is not willing to support SIUC in its time of need. He asked if this were a correct summarization of the situation.

**President Dunn** said he would not go on public record to say that.

**S Lahiri** noted that the data is misleading in discussion.

**President Dunn** said everyone will make what he/she will of the data. He said the argument currently was that given the evolution of SIUE in terms of enrollment and scope the formula should be redrawn.

**S Lahiri** noted that we were given partial facts.

**President Dunn** reiterated that facts will be interpreted and that this was a political question.

**S Lahiri** asked whether the board should see the whole picture.

**President Dunn** said that he thought that a richer history would be revealed by the consultants. He said that we do not have consultants yet because an amendment to “SIU bills” proposed the state do a study through the IBHE. The amendment has not been filed yet. There has also been discussions about the ramifications of dissolving the system. He questions whether he wants to spend thousands on a consultant when the IBHE could potentially be doing the study on its own dime.

**T McCubbin** asked about the status of a satellite law school.

**President Dunn** answered that discussion was pending. He said that there was support, desire, and excitement in Springfield for it. He added that the law school faculty ultimately would have to decide. Faculty want to have a discussion about the satellite being in Edwardsville. If there is a split in campuses, SIUE, he guessed, would have support to start its own law school.

**T Haniotakis** asked if it were being taken into account that students do not pay the same tuition between campuses, that there were differences in starting salaries of the graduates and differences in building upkeep. SIUC spends more money to maintain its old buildings.

**President Dunn** responded that these were all good points. He added that legislative solutions are generally blunt and politically driven and do not get to the actual factors that determine the need for reallocation. He said that if we can do this in a way that pulls out these drivers, it is going to make for a better reallocation decision. He said it is important for this process to be led by a third party consultant. He described the process in which the Board agrees on variables for measurement and then runs hypothetical formulas to see what reallocation does to each campus. He admitted that this was a complicated process.

- **Remarks—Chancellor Carlo Montemagno**

**Chancellor Montemagno** reported that reorganization was proceeding. He said that a number of RMEs have not gone out to schools, that they have been held back because schools are busy crafting their own ideas. He wants to see what those ideas are so as to better work together to get something that was a compromise between the two. IBHE, he added, is holding a special meeting in August for new programs. He understood that there was a resolution on the agenda for not meeting in the summer. He encouraged

the faculty consider abbreviated meetings over the summer to approve new graduate programs so that they can be brought before the IBHE and approved at the beginning of the fiscal year. He mentioned an update to the blog which reflects on the first 8 months of his role at SIUC. He was happy, too, to announce that a new enrollment manager was hired who he thinks will be a great team member once coming on board, May 14<sup>th</sup>.

**S Lahiri** asked if these new programs to be brought before the IBHE were related to the reorganization.

**C Montemagno** said that they were in the sense that faculty involved in the reorganization will want to get new programs in place for their new structures.

**L Schaefer** asked what the Chancellor meant by program changes coming “soon”.

**C Montemagno** said by “soon” he meant that they would reach his desk.

**L Chevalier** said she expected two more RMEs to come through her office by the end of the semester.

**S Lahiri** asked why these were not turned in sooner.

**L Chevalier** said it was a work flow issue. She said her office was proceeding carefully and deliberately in discussions with faculty and in the completion of documentation, gathering of minority opinion, etc., so that RMEs are accurately conveyed to the Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, and Faculty Association.

**T Clark** reminded the room of the sense of unity in the previous meeting. He said that the issue of reallocation would not go away and that it would not be good for the University to in-fight.

**S Lahiri** clarified that he was discussing new degree programs.

**L Chevalier** said that those were driven by faculty and not by the provost.

**S Lahiri** asked whether the faculty knew that the Graduate Council did not meet during the summer.

**L Chevalier** said she could not explain faculty or department choice regarding NUIs.

**S Lahiri** said then that the faculty should not blame the body.

**C Montemagno** said that there was no blame intended anywhere.

**L Chevalier** restated that IBHE called a special meeting for August which the University just found out about. It is not information her office was holding onto. Public universities must have been putting forward a significant number of NUIs to cause the IBHE to call a meeting. She thought that SIUC should give itself the opportunity to get programs out there and increase its competitiveness.

**D McDowell** asked what the administration would like to see happen over the summer.

**C Montemagno** hoped faculty would spend time looking at RMEs. He said he was reluctant to bring them to the board without Graduate Council review. He hoped RMEs/NUIs would be done and ready to go at the beginning of the academic year. He said impetus was to get the majority of reorganization done and academic programming in place so that SIUC could advertise those programs. In this way, we can start to prepare the marketing material for recruitment for FY20, he said. He added that if we delay on this, we are in danger of not capitalizing on a whole recruiting season.

**L Schaefer** noted the quick turnaround time. She asked what the process for gathering minority opinions would look like.

**L Chevalier** said her office would be forwarding what it had received and would not be collecting new minority opinions in the summer. She said she expected to review received RMEs during the summer.

**L Schaefer** clarified that those that were received by the end of the term.

**L Chevalier** answered yes and that she expected two more by the deadline.

**L Schaefer** asked if those received were complete RMES with faculty votes.

**L Chevalier** responded yes and that the process for NUIs was different. She explained the NUI process.

- **Remarks—Interim Provost Meera Komarraju**

**M Komarraju** reported that she found her new job to be humbling. She described her time at SIU and the different roles that she had held over her twenty year tenure. She said that she had the opportunity to experience the University from various perspectives. She argued that this was a time for the University to rally together. She referenced two meetings she had held with dean's council and GPSC. Her office is working on retention and has tasked Institution Research with a study that found the 4 year graduation rate was at 24%. She said this was an embarrassing statistic. She said she was also working with deans, who were reaching out to faculty to do exit interviews with students. In the stressful time for finals, her office also was providing money to colleges for student care packages and departmental refreshments. She then asked that deans, chairs, and faculty submit grades on time, as late grades can affect students who might lose academic aid or go on probation. Deans and colleges were also given money for recruitment which is a top priority. After meeting with the director of the graduate school and GPSC, she concluded that SIUC needs to do better in student mentoring and insuring success through preparation, professional development, and support when graduates leave the university. Finally, she spoke with deans about hiring plans. She proposed the need for strategic investment in programs that promise for growth. She wanted everybody to consider what is in the best interest of the university. Part of that is seizing the opportunity to propose NUIs to meet the IBHE August 12<sup>th</sup> deadline.

**L Schaefer** thanked M Komarraju, D DiLalla and L Chevalier, on behalf of GPSC.

**S Lahiri** noted that working together sometimes means agree with one side. He hoped that this was not what M Komarraju meant.

**M Komarraju** said she was looking to work collaboratively.

**J Lynn Smith** asked about recruiting Hispanic/Latino students who are currently the biggest growing university demographic.

**M Komarraju** said in a general decline in enrollment, Hispanic/ Latino populations were increasing. She met with the Hispanic/ Latino Student Council to discuss ideas about recruitment and student success.

**S Lahiri** mentioned a discussion about bilingual volunteers for campus visit days.

**C Awsumb** asked about budgeting contingencies after the board did not pass the reallocation measure.

**D DiLalla** said he had talked to deans about planning a response if it became necessary. He added that his office was moving forward with NTTs for the fall and that they held the President's view that funding would remain even. There was no new directive given to deans from his office.

**D McDowell** said that the Hispanic Law Student Association would be a good source to reach out to also.

**T McCubbin** asked about the Chancellor's proposal for a 1% raise.

**C Montemagno** said that it was in the budget and that it should be given after the July meeting.

**T Haniotakis** asked if the low graduation rate was due to the past admittance of “at risk” students.

**M Komarraju** noted that in the past two years, SIUC had controlled the number of students admitted with “at risk” status. She thought it would be a good idea to gather graduation data with and without at-risk numbers.

**L Schaefer** suggested the Council and M Komarraju continue to discuss graduation issues with GPSC.

**J Flowers** said that the appeal to the “at risk” metric was disingenuous when the institution has scaled back programs and resources to help students to matriculate out of the university. He said this would amount to blaming students of lower income and marginalized groups for dragging down the university when the university has made deliberate actions to cut programs that help those students succeed.

**M Komarraju** said that the point was well taken and that there should be support for all students including at risk students.

**L Schaefer** pointed to resolutions that had been stalled in the Council that provide effective mentoring.

**S Lahiri** said that the university should help everyone but that some need more help than others.

**M Komarraju** agreed.

**J Flowers** motioned to move the GPSC report up in the agenda

**L Schaefer** seconded.

**T Velasco** asked if there were any reasons for doing so.

**J Flowers** said that typically by the time the GPSC reported, the population of the room had dwindled to the point where few faculty and no administrators were present. He asked that the report be moved up to prior to the dean’s council report.

**T Velasco** said that the chair has the discretion to set the agenda. He said he organized the agenda so that the council could hear and vote on resolution action items with a quorum.

**W Calvert** offered a point of order that a change to the agenda required a 2/3 vote.

**\*The members of the council voted on the motion: 12 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstain. The motion did not pass with a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> vote.\***

- **Remarks—Vice Chancellor for Research Jim Garvey**

**J Garvey** remarked that the university currently had the opportunity to go after more federal grants since the federal government passed a large budget. He said that agencies have funding and that there are a number of RFPs going out from the NIH, NSF, and NEA. He reminded the council that his office would help faculty in searching for those grants. He said that there was a disturbing pattern in grant submission proposals. The university used to produce between 700-750 proposals per year; this year’s projection is in the 400s. He added that it is incumbent on faculty to seek external research funding through proposals. He concluded by apologizing for the delay in REACH award decisions, which was due to staffing issues. He said decisions should be out the following week.

**S Lahiri** asked if J Garvey knew the percentage of decrease in faculty doing research.

**J Garvey** said he did not have those numbers. He said the disturbing pattern was especially in Engineering and Computer Science. He said new faculty needed to submit proposals if their discipline thinks it important to do so. He thought that submitting NSF career grant proposals every two years was not enough.

**J Flower** asked if the decrease in proposals was due to faculty attrition that has resulted in greater workloads. He also asked if J Garvey had done anything to promote NEH infrastructure grants.

**J Garvey** said his office had been working on those and that he could not speak to workload. The trend was in proposals by assistant professors.

**J Lynn Smith** noted that she was on a committee attempting to get a grant for a digital humanities project for the Fuller dome.

**J Garvey** said that the NEH requires university matching funds. He said his office was ready to provide as much cost share as it can.

**K Hayashi** noted that external science grants are used to support students and quality of mentoring. She said that the university needed to increase mentoring. She added that grant proposals to NIH ask for preliminary data. She said that it was difficult for faculty at SIUC to provide that data. She suggested that we all needed to work together to make collecting this data possible because decreased preliminary data caused decreased proposal numbers. A gap exists between researchers getting preliminary data and limitations to collecting that data. The administration should work to fill this gap.

**M Komarraju** asked that K Hayashi please set up a time to meet with her office.

**T Haniotakis** agreed with K Hayashi. He said that he thought there was a lack in labs at SIUC which prevented the faculty from turning in grant proposals. He also noted that at SIUC there was a culture of trying to make money on grants when most universities do not expect to make money on grants but have endowments, etc. to use on research.

- **Remarks—Interim Associate Dean and Director of the Graduate School Juliane Wallace**

**J Wallace** reported that master's graduate application numbers were similar to the previous year. She said that there were some applications currently out with no decisions. She encouraged faculty to follow up on applications as quickly as possible. She said admissions were down 14% at the master's level. Applications at the doctoral level were down 3%, and admission were up 3%. She said that for the May graduation there would be 69 doctoral students, down 5 from the previous spring, 27 MFA students, up 2, and 448 other master's students, up 65. She noted that the university needs to replace those graduating students. She reiterated that departments should be diligent with application responses and added that enrollment in certain colleges was down as much as 50%. She said that she had also resubmitted a position request for a "Coordinator Recruitment and Retention of Graduate Diversity". She said she had revised the PRF from 2016 to include a preference for a bilingual candidate. She then mentioned Graduate Saluki Stories online and its aims to document the graduate student experience at SIUC. She asked if the faculty would recommend students for the project. In conclusion, she recognized those who had fulfilled their service on the Council with certificates of appreciation. She thanked all for their service on the Council.

**S Lahiri** said that he had a student who successfully defended but, due to missed deadlines, could not walk in May. He asked what could be done to resolve this.

**J Wallace** encouraged S Lahiri to contact the Graduate School. She said that she would like to be lenient in this respect to create goodwill with students who are leaving the university. She also noted a change to policy; PHDs and MAs will be receiving blank diplomas sleeves on the platform and would be asked to pick up the real diplomas from the Graduate School afterwards. She then referenced the issue with two distinct graduate transcripts for the masters and doctoral levels. Not every school, she said, has the problem. She wants to do some research to see what can be done.

**R Whaley** described the transcript issue for departments that want to confer an MA on students who did not, for whatever reason, finish the PHD. There are also problems when graduates go to get jobs. Other issues arise with programs that offer direct entry from the MA to the PHD. This a particular problem with the “instructor of record” when teachers are required to have a higher degree than their students. She then suggested there were options to deal with the issue.

**T Velasco** said that this would be something for the future Educational Policy Committee to consider.

**N Carver** said that this issue had come up years ago. There was some question then as to whether making changes to the transcripts was an IBHE issue or if it could be done by the Council.

**T Velasco** said that the issue would need to be taken up by the next council.

- **Remarks—Associate Provost for Academic Programs Lizette Chevalier—No Report**
- **Report—Council Chair, Tomás Velasco—No report.**

**T Velasco** thanked the council for allowing him to serve as its chair. He then introduced Scott Ishman who would be giving a presentation.

**\*Presentation from Scott Ishman on the faculty visit to ASU\***

**S Lahiri** said he was not against reorganization necessarily but was against the universal elimination of departments.

**S Ishman** admitted that ASU still did have some departments.

**S Lahiri** said that the point was that reorganization was necessary, but that he did not think the universal elimination of departments was a good way of going about it.

**J Flowers** thanked the group for visiting ASU, but he said that he felt they were behind the ball since he had done the research at the beginning of the fall semester after the Chancellor had offered ASU as an example of successful reorganization. He added that the presentation left out ASU’s elimination of 260 AP staff positions subsequent to the reorganization. He said that ASU had also merged crucial support structures for efficiency, structures that SIUC did not have the resources to merge. ASU also eliminated student support structures that, at SIUC, would damage recruitment and retention. ASU’s diversity outcomes were result of a diversity plan being put in place in conjunction with the reorganization. SIUC has no such plan. He reiterated that while the research just presented was valuable, ASU’s contextual situation is much different than SIUCs.

**C Anz** responded that the individuals that went on this trip were not behind the ball, but the university at large was. Some of them have been doing the research on this for many years. He said that in ASU terms they were researching “design aspirations”. He said the discussion was between organizational preservation versus social transformation. He said that it was not logical to expect that a departmental organization would guarantee social transformation. They are thinking about how to meet the demands of a changing society. He thought that the university was behind altogether on this. He also noted that

while ASU eliminated some programs, in 15 years they doubled in enrollment and created new programs well beyond the number of original cuts.

**M Eichholz** said that SIUC would never be ASU, but that it could use the model ASU provided to modify its culture and think about making changes without heavy costs. One problem with this change in culture has been the focus on restructuring. He hoped the Council got from the presentation that restructuring was just one small component of this change in mentality. He argued that the university needed to get away from a bureaucratic organization.

Action Item:

**Second Reading: Resolution in Support of Doctor of Education**

[Resolution in Support of a Doctor of Education.pdf](#)

**W Calvert** presented the resolution as written and expressed that the committee recommended a yes vote.

**\*Members voted on the resolution: 19 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstain. The resolution passed.\***

**Second Reading: Resolution in Support of Changes to the Graduate School's Academic Grievances Policy/Procedures**

[Resolution in Support of Changes to Graduate School Grievance Policy.pdf](#)

**J Lynn Smith** presented the resolution as written

**J Flowers** pointed out that in the first step for the informal resolution there was no provision for recording conclusions of resolution, of taking notes during meetings, or of providing for a third party arbitrator. He said that in his experience, informal resolutions do not work out in favor of students. He said that at the very least, the resolution needed a provision for an impartial observer for meetings and a provision for a mechanism for transmitting decisions to the department chair or the graduate dean. He added that there is also the possibility that a graduate student would not be comfortable with an informal meeting with faculty due to power dynamics. He said he was open to suggestions for addressing these concerns.

**J Lynn Smith** asked to clarify that J Flowers was talking about the section on departmental level provisions.

**T Velasco** noted that it was a second reading.

**J Flowers** suggested that language be added to put in place accountability measures for informal meetings. He added that his workload this semester had been adjudication when these informal meetings went wrong.

**W Calvert** said that he takes seriously the power differential between students and faculty. He said that he also took seriously the need for a specific proposal for a change in wording or an amendment to the resolution. If there were none, he proposed the move to a vote. The resolution had been being discussed in the executive committee where there was graduate student representation since September. It had also been discussed before the full Council.

**T Velasco** said the resolution was tabled last meeting to make sure that the lawyers got to see the resolution. He suggested that they table the resolution or vote on it.



**J Lynn Smith** asked if the previous resolution had this language to make sure that the current resolution was not any worse than what was originally proposed. She thought it was a good idea to pass this resolution now and add additional resolutions/clarifications in the future.

**J Partridge** thanked D DiLalla and T McCubbin for their input and work on the resolution. She asked to move the resolution forward at that point with the understanding that the Council will make additional clarifications later.

**\*Members voted on the resolution; 20 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstain. The resolution passed.\***

- **Report—Dean’s Council, Terry Clark**

**T Clark** said that in previous remarks he had tried to characterize what the reorganization looked like from a dean’s perspective and to give examples of when the Chancellor had been open-minded and had listened to arguments regarding reorganization. He added that during reorganization discussions, deans had also been dealing with attrition of faculty and staff. He emphasized that the deans, regardless of the difficult and trying times and the challenges of reorganization, remain resilient and optimistic. The alternative path to the reorganization, he thought, would not be good. Additionally, Edwardsville’s plans would not go away, and SIUC should be aware of the issues and prepare. He said that from his perspective the reorganization was not going fast enough for a number of reasons. For example, if SIUC did not prepare for the August IBHE meeting, other universities would gain an advantage over us. We would fall back once again because we fight internally. He concluded that the School of Business had invited 2 speakers to campus in the following days. He encouraged all to attend.

**S Lahiri** asked if the IBHE August meeting was about reorganization or new programs.

**L Chevalier** said that the special session is being held to deal with the number of NUIs being received.

**T Clark** answered that some of those NUIs would be a piece of the reorganization and that if we miss the opportunity, we would be set back.

**J Flowers** asked about the status of appointing a new interim dean for COLA.

**D DiLalla** said he was managing the process and waiting for the deadline for feedback from COLA colleagues. He said he wants to conclude the process as quickly as possible.

**J Flowers** noted that as of the previous day, the COLA council was not in compliance with its operating papers as there was an absence in the position of a student vice president.

**D DiLalla** suggested that J Flowers contact the COLA co-chair. He added he had no authority over COLA council nor would he presume to have it.

- **Report—Faculty Senate, James Wall**

**J Wall** reported that a new Senate had convened and that committee chairs, a new president, Jonathan Bean, and a new secretary had been approved. He said that the Senate looks forward to continued synergies between bodies. He said he would do anything he could to facilitate those synergies. He then discussed how the Senate had decided to handle the task of reorganization and the number of RMEs coming through the body. He said there was concern about the activities during the summer and that the Senate had decided to establish a special committee to be involved. He said that there is a meeting scheduled to brainstorm how to get individuals that will be available through the summer onto the committee. He concluded that the Senate was sensitive to the same circumstances as the Council.

**T Clark** said he had served on Senate for 12 to 13 years and that in that time, there were only two occasions when emergency meetings were called.

**J Flowers** asked if the Senate had taken action on his recommendation to add undergraduate representation to the proposed committee.

**J Wall** answered yes that the committee does include student participation as voting members and that the committee has been given the power to invite additional members.

- **Report—Council Vice-Chair, Julie Partridge**

**J Partridge** said that she had sent an email for volunteers to serve on the Chancellor's budget and planning committee. Four volunteered, and she would forward those names to Judy Marshall. She thanked people for volunteering. She then read a resolution in recognition of T Velasco's service as Council chair.

**W Calvert** motioned to suspend rules for an immediate vote on the above resolution and K Jones second.

**\*The members voted on the resolution: 17 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstain. The motion passed.\***

**W Calvert** motioned to return to rules, and K Jones seconded.

- **Report—New Programs, Wesley Calvert**

**W Calvert** reported that the committee did have a resolution for first reading as well as a report on their progress through a large collection of program change plans. Those plans were at varying stages in the review process. He said he recused himself from the review process of proposed RMEs for the School of Computing Sciences. The affected faculty had specific concerns not with substance but with form. He added that it was reasonable to hope that the process would produce favorable resolutions.

**First Reading: Resolution Opposing the Current Plan for the Creation of a School of Biological Sciences.**

**J Lynn Smith** asked to clarify that the objection was in the direct reporting of the proposed school to the provost.

**M Eichholz** responded that concern was over whether the direct reporting to the provost office would be temporary. With no evidence that it would be, they were concerned that reporting could go indefinitely.

**D Fisher** said that Microbiology agreed.

**M Eichholz** added that Zoology had been talking about this school proposal for a long time and that it was in support of the school but not in its organization.

**W Calvert** said that he had heard from Plant Biology that it was also in agreement with the substance but that the form needed work.

**T Velasco** said that his would be an issue for the new council.

**M Eichholz** noted that Physiology needed to be added to the resolution.

**W Calvert** said he believed that he had copied directly from the program change plan. He added that there was also an article in the *Daily Egyptian* in which a reporter misunderstood a comment from the committee. He wanted it to be perfectly clear that nothing is being decided on by anyone other than the Council. Where the New Program Committee is on proposal review was as presented. He feared that a reader could be misled to the conclusion that the committee was deciding whether a proposal was dead

and whether to bring it to the Council. He said that this was not happening. There was potential for misunderstanding so he wanted to make sure the facts were presented accurately.

- Report—Educational Policies, Jennifer Lynn Smith—No Report
- Report—Research, Sajal Lahiri—No Report
- Report—Program Review, Rachel Whaley—No Report
- Report—GPSC, Clay Awsumb

**C Awsumb** reported that he had two resolutions for first readings.

[2018-05-04 GPSC GradCon report.pdf](#)

### **First Reading: Resolution Regarding Summer Graduate Council Meetings**

**W Calvert** said he opposed the resolution, and there were right ways to achieve the requests of the resolution. He explained that the right way not to meet in the summer was to set a schedule of meetings that does not include meetings in the summer, select a council chair that is empowered to call special meetings and that will only call meetings when important. He noted that weeks ago we had a legitimate occasion to hold a special meeting. He also was not sure that the Council had the power to restrict a future council from meeting when it pleased, nor did he think it would be prudent if they did.

**T Haniotakis** said he agreed that there should not be meetings during the summer, but that the Council should not place unnecessary restrictions on itself.

**J Flowers** said that the resolution calls for adherence to the established schedule. He said GPSC wanted to publically recognize the problems of trying to make reorganization decisions over the summer; none of the GPSC representatives would be present. He said he could not in good conscience agree with decisions made without this representation. He added that the resolution was meant to remind the council that it had an established meeting schedule and that the chair should not deviate from the schedule would. He thought that the Senate had forwarded a similar statement.

**S Donahoo** said from the perspective of the New Program Committee a lot of the RMEs were not ready for review. During the school year, it can ask faculty for clarification on those RMEs. She was not sure how much progress would take place over the summer in this case.

**L Schaefer** said she thought GPSC wanted to set publically clear expectations of what the Council and its committees expect over the summer. She thought this was important considering the Chancellor's remarks about volunteering time over the summer.

**W Calvert** thought expectations are clear for those who have followed the scheduling of the Council. The Council has in the past met during the academic year, conducted its business during the academic year, and scheduled only the most important meetings outside of the academic year. The executive committee thought having a special council to hurry proposals through that the council would not approve did not sound like a good use of anyone's time. This resolution, he thought didn't add anything over status quo.

**L Schaefer** said that the precedence for RMEs to come through with all signatures had not been adhered to, and that during the reorganization, precedence did not seem to matter. The resolution did not hurt anything.

**W Calvert** said that the disadvantage was that the Council members look like wage laborers who are trying to show that they will not work one minute past their contract. They were professionals and if something important came up would deal with it.

**T McCubbin** said she was offended by the resolution's language that the council "will not deviate" from the schedule and the "New Program Committee and Education Policy Committee will not meet". She added that GPSC did not have any power to demand this.

**C Awsumb** said that the resolution simply asked the Council to resolve not to meet during the summer. He said it did not say GPSC had the power to demand this.

**J Flowers** said there is a benefit to acting as the wage laborer in leveraging our position.

**T Haniotakis** said that the second reading would be voted on at the next meeting in the fall.

**J Flowers** said that a second reading would be scheduled for the meeting immediately following the current one.

**Multiple Members** noted that there was no agenda item in the following meeting for a second reading for either of the resolutions

**J Lynn Smith** asked if there had been any proposals to meet in the summer.

**T Velasco** said no and that it was merely suggested by the Chancellor that we consider the possibility of abbreviated meetings over the summer.

**T Haniotakis** said that something might happen with the state budget, for example, and that the council might need to meet. He asked again why restrict ourselves.

**C Awsumb** recognized that the resolution would make it impossible to meet without a further resolution. He pointed out a problem in the language and that passing it would unnecessarily restrict the council's abilities to hold meetings. He proposed moving forward on the agenda.

#### **First Reading: Resolution Regarding Graduate Council Agenda Order**

**T Velasco** said that the GPSC was as important as everyone else. He said that he put the GPSC report last because the Council needed the chance to question and hear from the administration. He then proceeded to resolutions that needed to be voted on. He added that he had changed his schedule organization the previous year to make sure that there was a quorum to vote on action items.

**T McCubbin** said she supports the resolution. After the Chair's report, people would still be present.

**W Calvert** said he agreed about the importance of hearing from graduate students and GPSC. He did note the word count in the minutes depicting GPSC perspective and that he thought the Council was already hearing a good deal of GPSC perspective. The present ordering came about after the Council received some long reports from GPSC that interrupted orderly flow of business.

**L Schaefer** said GPSC was asking questions early because it did not have time at the end. She said that GPSC did have institutional knowledge that was valuable to report. If GPSC was moved up the agenda, there would be fewer questions throughout.

**K Jones** asked if the Council was locked into two hour meetings or if they could plan for three hours.

**T Velasco** said he started writing times because the previous dean insisted he did. He said he wanted to give time to everyone. He did comment that there was going to be a new chair of the council presently who would be involved in creating the agenda.

**C Awsumb** thought the proposed location would make logical sense: Graduate School Report, Graduate Council Chair, and then Graduate Student Representatives. He wanted to make sure the administration heard graduate student positions.

**T Haniotakis** said proposed scheduling flexibility or putting a time restriction on each report.

**E Russo** said that if the Council wanted to stress the importance of maintaining enrollment and getting graduate students to degree, it should prioritize more space for GPSC to present questions early.

**T Velasco** noted that the position GPSC proposed moving to was ahead of action items. The solution is either to restrict time on everything we do or extend the meeting time, he concluded.

**L Schaefer** said agenda placement makes it appear as if GPSC is the most disposable body on the Council.

**J Flowers** said that the body meets for the shortest period of time of any other body on campus.

**T Velasco** restated the two options for considering time.

**D McDowell** said he agreed with T Velasco about the two options. He thought that moving GPSC to after the action items would give GPSC the chance to be heard. He reiterated that this was one of their few chances to voice opinions. He was cognizant that limiting time is often used in Robert's Rules.

**W Calvert** motioned to adjourn and K Jones seconded that motion: 14 in favor, 0 oppose, 0 abstain.

**Adjournment:** The Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 10:53AM.