

2017 Graduate Council

Meeting Minutes

October 5, 2017

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

Members Absent: William Babcock and Greg Rose.

Proxies: James MacLean for Buffy Ellsworth, Johnathan Flowers for Jordan Maddox, and Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Terry Clark, David DiLalla, Ahmad Fakhoury, James Garvey, Yueh-Ting Lee, and Carlo Montemagno.

Guests: Ruth Anne Rehfeldt, Eric Jacobs, and Mark Peterson.

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM.

Consideration of Minutes:

Spelling correction on page one, paragraph four—"memebers" to "members."

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes for the meeting held September 7, 2017—19 in favor and 1 in abstention. The minutes passed.

Remarks—Chancellor Carlo Montemagno

Chancellor Montemagno first welcomed everyone and expressed his hope that the semester was going well and that everyone was moving forward with their efforts. He said that in the aftermath of the State of the University Address, his office is in the process of putting the final touches on the strawman he referenced at the prior meeting. The strawman will be released to leadership on the morning of October 19th, and then an open forum will be held for the community during which the entire structure that has been proposed will be presented. The forum is going to be at 2PM on October 19th. A key element of this effort will be the Graduate Council's working with the Chancellor's Office to elevate the quality of graduate programs so that the University can move forward together. The Chancellor said that he wishes to move SIUC from an R2 to an R1 institution, which will involve dramatically increasing the number of PhD students by around 100 students a year. The University should also see a new school structure and a number of requests for removing departmental structures. There will, additionally, be a larger consolidation of resources, which the Chancellor believes will enable the University to function with a much higher critical mass, as it builds its enrollment. Chancellor Montemagno then said that SIUC will be working on this with the understanding that not for the next review in two or three years, but in the following review, it will be an R1 institution. The University should expect to see intense faculty involvement right after October 19th as well. The Chancellor has already tasked a subcommittee led by Vice-Chancellor Garvey to begin identifying potential areas for investment, especially in multidisciplinary

areas. This process will include faculty in the Arts and Humanities. Research in the Arts and Humanities needs to be supported and elevated to make sure that it moves forward with the University.

J Flowers asked for a point of clarification as to whether or not by releasing the strawman draft to university leadership, the Chancellor was also planning on releasing it to student leadership.

Chancellor Montemagno responded that as he indicated above, the draft would be released to the entire community on the afternoon of October 19th.

T McCubbin asked if a location for this forum had been chosen.

Chancellor Montemagno said yes; a room (TBA) will be used in the student center.

D McDowell asked whether or not, going back to the State of the University Address, the lack of reference to the Graduate School was purposeful in going forward with planning. Also, he asked if that omission should be interpreted as an acquiescence to the Law School's current policy.

Chancellor Montemagno said he believed he was clear in the Address that the University would attempt to move from an R2 to an R1 institution. Implicit in that is an expansion of graduate activity. With regards to the Law School, specifically, he said that he does not intend to change its structure. He does plan to change the activities that go on in the Law School to raise the quality and standards of the students who get admitted and the rigor of the scholarly enterprises that are going on therein. The Chancellor then said that the Institution is looking to reassert SIUC's Law School as one of the best in the State of Illinois.

C Awsumb asked how departments may be affected by institutional restructuring.

Chancellor Montemagno answered that departments are the place where programs are housed, so even if departments are no more, programs will remain intact. The Chancellor was clear that restructuring was not going to change the programs and would not negatively impact the students but would change the way the University administers its resources. Additionally, it should remove the barriers between departments, allowing for the possibility for cross-disciplinary work and enhanced resource flow.

K Jones asked if the Chancellor could tell the Council a bit about the process for receiving feedback after October 19th.

Chancellor Montemagno said that after October 19th, his office would solicit comments from the faculty and leadership. His office would also be asking the faculty to indicate the schools with which they identify so that they can start to get their heads around what the organization will look like. Governance of the individual schools will be left up to the faculty. They will develop and submit for approval their own operating papers, defining themselves and how they wish to be organized. The Chancellor also hopes new programs will replace old ones. The Chancellor said that he intends to propose six programs in the new structure. He said that this was not necessarily about retrenchment, but about how to consolidate resources to make programs stronger.

D DiLalla clarified that several contractual obligations are associated with this from the start, obligations which the University is committed to honoring. His office is drawing up a road map for how to implement these changes.

K Jones asked if the Chancellor was envisioning that entire programs move as entities.

Chancellor Montemagno answered yes, as entities. The University might see programs move to different schools. Then faculty are going to have to make decisions about their new tenure requirements.

S Rimmer asked about thoughts on the new bill introduced in the Illinois House of Representatives, proposing that the IBHE evaluate all programs at universities.

Chancellor Montemagno said he had not seen the bill yet but that there was a lot of rumination going on about it with the Presidents and Chancellors of universities around the State. He said he does not know enough about it now to make a judgement.

S Lahiri clarified that the Chancellor mentioned Arts and Humanities but did not mention the Social Sciences.

Chancellor Montemagno responded that the Social Sciences were included in the above discussion. The Chancellor said to S Lahiri that when he sees the new structure, it will be quite evident that the Social Sciences are included.

T McCubbin said she understood that in restructuring the University, there would just be degree tracks within larger schools.

Chancellor Montemagno answered 'yes' that that was correct.

S Hart commented that this was a process that her Alma Mater underwent and her experience was that degree tracks can keep their resources. She asked then if entire schools will maintain a collective budget and not have to compete for those resources.

Chancellor Montemagno indicated that the mechanisms for allocating those resources had not been touched on.

S Hart asked if that meant it had not yet been figured out.

Chancellor Montemagno said that it was being discussed and that his first job is to energize the academic enterprise with more opportunities for SIUC's graduate students. He seeks also to provide communities with critical mass. His proposal, he says, deals with the fact that the University's faculty numbers have dwindled. He said he wants to bring in people with similar interests and allow them to contribute and decided how funds are allocated. People can then contribute to programs as needed.

D DiLalla clarified that from a budgetary perspective, there will be a single budget associated with a school. How resources will be allocated and distributed to schools has not been determined.

T McCubbin asked if the Chancellor could share some of the programs he intends to propose.

Chancellor Montemagno listed Bioinformatics and Gerontology. He said he would not get into others, but that the programs would run the gamut of SIUC's academic enterprise. Faculty should comment on these proposed programs. Additionally, schools will be tasked with providing a plan by which at least one program in their school will become ranked in the top ten in the nation.

J Shapiro asked how promotion and tenure would work under restructuring.

Chancellor Montemagno answered that operating papers will be determined within schools.

D DiLalla reminded the room that contractually, for existing faculty, the promotion and tenure procedures that are enforced are those that were in place at the point of hire or last promotion unless a faculty member chooses to use the new operating papers. There is already a procedure in place to manage this. D DiLalla reiterated that it is critical to let faculty know that they have the right to take the promotion criteria in the operating papers as indicated at the point of hire or last promotion.

J Flowers asked whether or not the same procedure applied to current students?

D DiLalla said yes. Current students are entitled to use the criteria in place when they came into the program. As time goes on, colleges will have to decide what they do for new students.

J Flowers asked if when the Chancellor said the strawman proposal will be a big part of the dialogue, that he also meant that students would be included in that dialogue.

Chancellor Montemagno responded that students will have a voice just like they have always had. The process will be two-fold: the community at large will provide comment and input. And then all constituency groups will be offered the opportunity to offer input. The Chancellor said it will be an open process, but that he is not looking for consensus. He is not looking for a five year long dialogue. His office will get input, evaluate it and adjust, and then move forward.

W Calvert asked if there were any institutions that have similar structures to the ones we are looking to have.

Chancellor Montemagno said there are some, but that he is not using them for models of what SIUC will do. He said he uses the unique features associated with admission, financial structure, and goals and aspiration that the University currently has to do what is right for SIUC. SIUC is in a unique position with its unions, for example. Self-assurance depends on the quality and comfort of the leadership at the University. SIUC cannot afford to play it safe and is a far better University than to dither around 214 nationwide. The Chancellor said he is not happy with 200. In 7 years, he hopes to be at the 175 range and well on the road to being in the 75 range.

W Calvert followed up that he is happy to learn a new way to structure the University but that there is not much in the last one hundred years to learn from universities that have done away with disciplinary departments.

Chancellor Montemagno said he was open to his thoughts once the framework was presented.

J Flowers asked if the Chancellor could briefly give his plans for University diversity.

Chancellor Montemagno said the University would be changing core curriculum to include a requirement for multicultural education and engagement.

Remarks—Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost, Dave DiLalla

D DiLalla summarized his activity in assisting the Chancellor with the development of the reorganization plan. He said that his office had been working closely in consultation with Lizette Chevalier on the UCOL reorganization or essentially the elimination of UCOL as an administrative entity. He indicated that the most important point to make about this reorganization is that the administrative structure and not the programs that compose UCOL are going away. UCOL programs are being assigned to different places, which mostly, but not wholly, applies to the undergraduate population. He then clarified that there were certainly UCOL services that the graduate population are supported by. Nothing about those services changes. The majority of these programs, he said, are moving to Student Affairs, which is a common home for those kinds of support services at universities like SIUC. Exploratory Student Advisement, the UCOL 101 program, and Core Curriculum are moving to the Provost's office. He added that SIUC is also in the process of centralizing academic advising. This centralization will not impact graduate student training. The purpose of reorganizing advisement is to assure that the University has first rate advising across campus. He said that we recognize we have some variability when advising occurs, so we are going to centralize to assure uniform advisor training and uniform advising processes.

R Whaley asked if D DiLalla could talk a bit about graduate student recruitment this year and admissions to programs that may look very different next year in the spring.

D DiLalla responded that, as everyone knew, some programs have been identified for elimination under the sustainability plan. Academic programs outside of that group, he said, are not going anywhere and should be business as usual. He hopes that recruitment will be enhanced by this process and that it should provide more opportunities to faculty associated with remaining programs. He said those programs are not going away, but are just living in a different administrative structure.

R Whaley said that she is hearing from more students this year who are excited about applying to the program. She also indicated that RMEs had been submitted for Sociology for a direct entry into the PHD through the MA. R Whaley asked if it would be possible to discuss with the Graduate School the possibility of a PhD student's stopping along the way to get an MA in the program.

D DiLalla responded that those kinds of discussions are about programs. He does not see any reason why they would not continue. Only the administrative wrapper is changing.

J Lynn Smith said that some are worried about what kind of representation programs will have in this new school organization.

D DiLalla responded that he considers the School of Allied Health in CASA to be an excellent example of an organizational structure with degree programs housed within the school. He said that even in his program, multiple aspects of the graduate programs have coordinators associated with them. He said that we might think about this organization at the informal vision level, some loosely defined division associated with the former department. That division might involve coordinators assisting the school directors. Responsibility, he said, is obviously with the director, but in some complex schools, there might be coordinators who work closely with the directors. He said he envisions the same thing happening in this new organization.

J Flowers asked if with the centralization of admissions processes there would be additional resources allocated to the Graduate School and Graduate Student Recruitment. He clarified asking then if there will be an allocation of additional resources to the Graduate School to help recruitment and retention of the graduate population.

D DiLalla clarified that if he misspoke and said there will be a centralization of the admission processes that that was not correct. Centralization has to do with academic advising at the undergraduate level. He believes we might see in the future an approach that is less centralized with respect to graduate admissions. The people that are most involved and know the most about how to recruit graduate students are the faculty and the administrators and leaders in the academic units. He reiterated that there is no plan to centralize the admissions process.

J MacLean asked if when restructuring occurs and conflicts arise there will be arbitration. He clarified, asking if a higher level arbitrator will step in if consolidated departments cannot come to a consensus.

D DiLalla said that we have complex departments now with multiple areas of focus. They agree sometimes and disagree sometimes. We have procedures already in place if conflicts occur. I do not envision an outside arbitration process for school or departmental level disagreements. If there is a contractual dispute and we cannot resolve it, there is an arbitration process associated with that. However, for school level management and organization, we are going to find strong leaders to appoint to those positions.

T Velasco asked how the transfer of tenure was going to happen in this restructuring.

D DiLalla answered that if at the end of the process an entire academic program and the faculty affiliated with it are moving to another academic unit or college, the University will fill out a change of assignment form that indicates an assignment change from this tenure home to the new tenure home.

S Lahiri asked about the contractual commitments according to the Faculty Association contract and the clause line that sets the process for change of tenure. According to this clause, changing tenure home is not just signing a piece of paper, he said.

D DiLalla said that what policy tells us to do, we will do. He told S Lahiri that he was quite right according mainly to university policy and not to the CBA. The processes exist by which a faculty can request a change of tenure home. He does not see that as what would be occurring here. If the University merges two departments, the faculty in Department A that hold tenure are going to automatically hold tenure in the new merged school.

S Lahiri clarifies that accordingly a new organization that says my tenure home is changing binds the University to the contractual commitment to established processes and that there is a timetable there of 90 days.

D DiLalla answered that of course if we are doing anything that falls under the auspices of Article 9 on collective bargaining provisions, we absolutely are going to follow policy.

S Lahiri asked D DiLalla to confirm that there was a timetable on that process.

D DiLalla answered that this was correct.

J Flowers recalls the discussion of the financial stability plan early in the meeting. He then asked if D DiLalla would give the Council line-by-line the status of each of those initiatives in the financial sustainability plan, beginning with the merger of the Graduate School and concluding with the elimination of programs. He then asked if we will ever get to see the prioritization from the Deans and the metrics that came out of the Provost's office. He then asked if the answer to any of the above was no, could he FOIA this information.

D DiLalla said that he could not speak to that at this time.

S Rimmer indicated that there had been talk about some form of savings from this reorganization. She then asked D DiLalla if he could expand on the idea of salary savings in going from a system where the University has deans and chairs to a system of program, small "d" directors.

D DiLalla replied that the salary savings are in the department chairs. If we go from 55 departments to 19 schools then that is where the savings come from.

S Rimmer then asked about staff.

D DiLalla said that his understanding is that the Chancellor has no interest in reducing staff. That doesn't mean that they are going to stay exactly where they are. When we went through the process of reducing staffing in the budget reduction process, we started with an attempt to place folks in open positions if there was no longer a need for them in another places. Savings should come from the administrative reduction of department chairs.

J Lynn Smith mentioned this was causing a lot of anxiety because people in chair positions are already doing a lot more work because of staff shortages. She asked would program directors more or less do the same thing and get a course release.

D DiLalla said there are a lot of models for this, and he alluded to CASA program coordinators again, who receive some combination of course releases and summer support for programs that are in demand during the summertime. Because of the merger, in terms of administration support, we are going to have plenty of staff who can support those departments that have been struggling; they will see some relief in this. We will have to develop how that works at the program level, but as of now, we have some models of how that has worked effectively elsewhere.

J Flowers asked to clarify that no structural plans exist for changes to work load in the transfer from chairs to program directors. He clarified that currently chairs do a lot of work. If program directors are going to be doing a comparable amount of work, are there contractual protections for work load when a program coordinator becomes a different assignment than a department chair?

D DiLalla said that we are going to address work load as we always have under the contractual obligations for assigning workload. Reducing 55 chairs to 19 program coordinators will return chairs back to faculty status so they can reengage in research and teaching. Program coordinators will be assigned appropriate workloads, what the contract requires, for example a 25% FTE or course erase.

S Hart said that in her experience the way this restructuring happens is that those departments that had a bigger budget under an old structure were able to receive more resources under the new structure. Smaller programs then lost GTAs, lost courses and faculty, and became less profitable in the long run. She then asked that given the way the budget has worked out and the fact that several departments have lost faculty members, who decides how those faculty lines are put back into the departments. She said currently graduate students have been reporting a lack of access to mentors and a lack of access to classes that they need. Do we say that whichever department that had the most money before gets the most faculty lines after restructuring?

D DiLalla answered no. Faculty salary lines are centralized so that if someone leaves the university, resigns, or retires that line comes back to the central administration. The simplest answer is that central administrations will make determinations as to where faculty hires occur. It used to be that if someone retired in Department A, it was presumed that rehire would occur in Department A. He said that this was no more. We are going to look across the University to where faculty hires need to be made. The other important thing goes back to school leadership; strong leaders, he said, do not do what S Hart described at the beginning.

K Jones asked if there have been talks of addressing how budgets are allocated, if there are models being used.

D DiLalla said there are new models being used because it doesn't make sense to do what SIUC did before. The University leadership will have to struggle with what the OTS budget for a new consolidated school should look like.

K Jones followed up by asking if besides the restructuring of programs there will be another layer of restructuring of budgets, resource allocations, space allocations, etc.

D DiLalla responded that physically moving people is way down the list of priorities. He said that maybe when structures are in place globally, we can consider how we wish to look physically. Coming up with a plan for this now seems needlessly distracting.

C Awsumb asked about a general sense of the number of programs to be combined

D DiLalla said that 19 schools across six colleges was initially proposed.

C Awsumb clarified that in other words programs and degrees that remain will be spread across 19 schools

D DiLalla answered that that was correct.

Remarks—Interim Vice-Chancellor for Research, James Garvey

J Garvey said that the Chancellor has made it very clear that he wants us to become an R1 Institution. Carnegie does not use the term R1 anymore; however, it uses distinctions of highest, higher, and high research universities. How that is determined is largely based on graduate enrollment, primarily at the doctoral level. Also it considers the amount of external funding from various sources, mostly federal. If the University does not make a big commitment to doctoral education, it will not move up in the rankings. So it is going to be incumbent upon all of us to figure out ways to enhance doctoral education on this campus.

J Flowers asked if J Garvey could suggest improvements for 2 years of 10% decline in doctoral student admissions.

J Garvey responded that the first thing that needs to happen is an increase in externally funded programs. The Chancellor has asked J Garvey to bring a group of primarily STEM research center directors to come to SIUC to figure out ways to enhance research opportunities on campus. The idea is that it will build graduate programs and those graduate programs would then generate enough funding to invest in other kinds of programs that might not have the same opportunities for funding as STEM, for example in the humanities, social sciences, and arts. The University will begin by jumpstarting certain research opportunities where there are low-hanging fruit. Opportunities exist in the material sciences, technologies, and engineering. Materials is fairly cheap in terms of instrumentation and facilities needed. The funding opportunities are vast. SIUC also has a group of engineers and scientist who can do very well in the material space. The University might also see some distinguished faculty come in to nab the big grants not only from NSF, but also from the USDA, the Department of Defense, and industry. Those grants will hopefully fund large groups of post-docs and doctoral students. The indirect, we will pull back into other research programs. SIUC should see its activity start to light up fairly quickly. As he said at the last meeting, research has not dwindled here, but it also has not grown considerably. He believes that if we give more energy in the right places, we will start seeing growth on campus.

S Lahiri said the Chancellor mentioned that the number of doctoral students needs to be increased by 100 a year to put SIUC in the higher or highest category; how many are we graduating now?

Y Lee said he would comment on this in his remarks.

J Garvey said that it was more complicated than this and that the way Carnegie calculates rankings is based on a complex components analysis that measures the success of all the universities not only by the number of graduate students in various programs, but also by investments per capita per faculty member. Small universities can be ranked highly if they have a lot of post-docs and doctoral students. SIUC needs to play the game the right way to break into the highest space.

J Maclean asked if J Garvey could clarify whether prominent faculty would be brought in as advisors or as permanent hires.

J Garvey responded that salaries are centralized, but there would be certain programs where the Chancellor would probably make investments in a number of faculty with high research capacities. Materials is one area, including Gerontology and some others. The Chancellor is not only looking for scholarship, but at the pragmatic issues. The ability to bring in funds at this point is crucial. He also pointed out that J Lynn Smith is working with the Humanities in terms of finding some synergies for research opportunities. He said he believes a university could not succeed in this world without incorporating the Arts and Humanities into the Sciences. He and the Chancellor are looking for a holistic approach.

S Rimmer reiterated that the Chancellor wants to end up in seven years around the ranking of 175. She then asked what, if we go back a few years, our ranking was.

Y Lee said he believe around 152.

S Rimmer said she thought the 160s going back only three or four years.

J Garvey responded that he thought moving up in the rankings was completely doable. Rankings from the US News and World Report is based on reputational measures and not solely on dollars brought in. The University also looks at the NSF HERD Survey done every year that looks at the amount of money universities invest in research and development. Typically SIUC is around 200 in this measure. Our reputation will go up if we continue to talk about the quality of the University.

S Rimmer said she asks because she wonders if the University has evaluated what sorts of factors caused our going down from 165 to 200 or 214 in such a short period of time. She wondered if it was necessary to do a complete restructuring, when the University was ranked much higher under a similar organizational structure just before the budget crisis.

J Garvey said that from a research stand point, things haven't changed much and that SIUC has hit the \$75 million ceiling and stayed there for 6-8 years. Reputation, research, and scholarship have not changed, yet we are not growing like we should be.

S Lahiri commented that the rankings have a lot of noise. He did not know if they are stable at all or whether to pay much attention to them.

D DiLalla responded that the Chancellor would agree. U.S. World Report does not mean anything from a methodological point of view. These rankings are important for people out there, who attach a lot of meaning to them.

T Velasco added that rankings are important to people who are assuming that those rankings are correct.

J Garvey said that anecdotally Georgia Tech has entered his radar by word of mouth and that word of mouth is very important to most people.

T Haniotakis reiterated that \$75 million is spent on research and that the University would like an additional 100 doctoral students. According to his calculations, the University currently spends around \$10-15 thousand a year per graduate student that, over 4 or 5 year, with all of the doctoral students including an additional 100 PhDs, comes out to about \$6-7 million out of \$75 million spent on graduate students per year. He commented that we wonder why we do not have more PhDs.

J Garvey said that the reality is that PhDs need to be funded by external sources until the University builds up enough indirect cost that it can allow the money to be put back in. The University should also be thinking about endowments that increase funds for graduate support.

T Haniotakis asked whether or not it was currently possible for the University to provide \$10-15 million for PhDs.

J Garvey said this kind of funding is in the realm of possibility depending on how the University wishes to invest in doctoral students and post-docs.

J Flowers noted that he found it troubling that the Council kept returning to Georgia Tech as a model. Georgia Tech is in Atlanta and receives funding from a variety of places including a partnership with the CDC. This is not a University that has similar resources and is an inapplicable comparison.

D DiLalla said that no one is saying that SIUC should emulate Georgia Tech. It is just an example of a University that moved quickly in the rankings in part because of anecdotal reputation.

J Flowers said the context of how Georgia Tech moved quickly is not applicable to SIUC.

D DiLalla said that maybe it is and maybe it is not. Regardless, SIUC has faculty and scholars who should be assisted in finding external funding. The message is that we need to control what we can first, because we are not going to get a lot of help from the State.

Remarks—Graduate School Dean, Yueh-Ting Lee

Dean Lee indicated that he had several areas to report on. The first was graduation and degree completion. He said that in May and in August, SIUC had a total of 639 graduate students who earned their master's degrees and 126 students who earned their PhDs. On Sept 22, he went to the Springfield campus where he attended an informal summer graduation ceremony for mostly PhD students and one master's student. Amazingly, there were approximately 50 participants at this informal ceremony. Y Lee then reminded the Council that September, October, and November is the University's recruitment season. Graduate staff members have been busy attending different graduate events at different institutions. Additionally, in the month of September, the Graduate School offered a series of training sessions and workshops to graduate directors, graduate faculty, and other supporting staff members. The Admission Office offered three training sessions on how to use the Radius platform. Apply Yourself (AY) will be phased out in January 2018. Approximately 55 people attended this technology training session. At the end of September, the Graduate school also organized two workshops for chairs, graduate directors, and other graduate staff members on the best practices of graduate student admission, records and degree completion, and contracts. There were approximately 30 participants. On September 26th, he sent a memo to all chairs, school directors, and graduate directors with regard to graduate student travel support, department research talk support, the Willis Swartz Award, the Three-Minute Thesis competition, and the Graduate Faculty Mentorship Award nomination process. Dean Lee concluded with some announcements. The Graduate School will organize a new fellowship recognition ceremony on October 12. Also, November will be national philanthropy month. He and the Fundraising Office will need graduate faculty, graduate students, graduate alumni, and the external advisory board to help in the fundraising campaign. He encouraged all to support graduate education and graduate programs at SIUC. Lastly the Graduate Saluki Stories is in the production stage and will come out soon.

Remarks—Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Lizette Chevalier

No Remarks

Report—Council Chair, Tomás Velasco

T Velasco gave an update on the research collaboration with SIUE. He said that he had sent out a link to the "speed network" form. The whole objective of this project is to have people interact with each other, provide ideas, and establish interdisciplinary research collaborations. The SIUC Law School is going to be doing a session with the SIUE Law School. No date is set, but the conversation has been started. T Velasco is proposing one in STEM as well. If anyone wants to hold a speed networking event,

they may contact T Velasco. He will have the first STEM event here and the following on the SIUC campus.

Guest Report:

R Rehfeldt gave a brief update on SIUC's efforts in the Higher Learning Commission reaccreditation process. She, as the HLC Re-Accreditation Coordinator for SIUC, will be submitting an assurance argument, now a contemporary to the self-study, to the Higher Learning Commission in March of 2019. Site visitors will visit campus in the fall of 2019 and spring of 2020. Over a 10 year period, beginning with the last accreditation process in 2009 and 2010, the University has been and will be scrutinized. 5 subcommittees are doing the bulk of the work on this project. The project is not writing intensive but involves gathering documentation that the HLC will then use to determine the extent to which SIUC has met the 21 core components for reaccreditation. The 5 subcommittees correspond to the five main reaccreditation criteria. What those committees have done so far is compare outlines with the data and have been through multiple rounds of review outlines. There will also be a 49 person steering committee with representatives from all the different constituency groups across campus who have reviewed the outlines so far. According to timeline, in spring and fall of 2018 there should be opportunity for all of campus to provide feedback on the draft of the assurance argument. The draft must be posted for so many days, and we will also have an open campus meeting later this fall. Too, there will be an accreditation survey; it is under construction. One issue that the team has been struggling with is how to meet the component criteria that has to do with the University's mission. The core component specifies that our mission must be accessible on a day-to-day basis and tied to the day-to-day operations of the Institution. People at other universities told R Rehfeldt that when site visitors came, they asked everyone they met to recite the mission. Our visitors will want to see a visible mission. The team struggles with this, though it added the mission to D2L, syllabi, documents that are distributed to students, and to websites. R Rehfeldt said she welcomes ideas on this.

Report—Dean's Council, Terry Clark

T Clark gave the council a sense of the climate of the Deans Council, beginning from the Chancellor Search process. He said that there is a real appetite among the Deans for change. In fact, he said, it was an urgency that if we didn't change, SIUC would not continue as it is. To stumble into the future in the same state wouldn't be good, he said. Additionally there was an urgency to the meetings with the candidates. The Deans all wanted someone who would help SIUC pivot into the future; higher education is changing, and many aspects of SIUC haven't changed for decades. He said that while change is scary, it can also be invigorating. Everyone has had a first look at the outline that the Chancellor shared earlier. Deans are excited and see opportunities for SIUC to join its peer institutions in the 21st century.

Report—Faculty Senate, Ahmad Fakhoury

A Fakhoury indicated that a meeting was held on September 5th, and a few resolutions were passed. The first was a resolution to recommend approval of the proposal for internal and external program reviewers for the 2017-2018 review cycle. There were also a number of RMEs. The first was to add a Bachelor's of Science in Family Services and to add a minor in Hospitality, Tourism, and Event Management. The Director for Learning Support Services attended the meeting and gave a brief and very informative talk about the services they provide. Faculty Senate will also be hosting a social hour with the Chancellor at the Underground, Thursday October 19th between 3 and 5pm.

J Flowers asked if graduate students could attend this event.

A Fakhoury responded that it is generally for the faculty but that he would find out.

T McCubbin asked if it was any coincidence that the social hour was being held on the same day that the Chancellor was releasing his strawman.

A Fakhoury responded that there was no knowledge of the strawman release date when planning the event.

Report—Council Vice-Chair, Julie Partridge

J Partridge said that a committee request had just come in from Dean Lee's office, and that she would like to make the Graduate Council aware so that those interested in serving could. A 2017-2018 Graduate School Fundraising Advisory Committee will be convened to work with alumni and external advisory board members. Y Lee has indicated that he is looking to meet once or twice a semester for this committee. He is also looking to have 2 faculty and 2 graduate students on the committee, with 1 faculty having an international interest focusing on domestic and international alumni. Anyone interested is to contact J Partridge.

Reports from Standing Committees:

New Programs Committee: Wesley Calvert

W Calvert first reading of "Resolution in Support of Master's Degree Changes in Psychology."

J Flowers asked if it will be resolved to remove the thesis option for the MS in Psychology and turn it into a terminal degree without the possibility for matriculation into the PhD.

E Jacobs said that this was part of it. The MS has been a consolation prize for students that struggle with research but shine in other ways in the classroom, as instructors or even lab technicians. He said that this resolution is designed to provide students who have been at the institution for a few years with an MS that they can use to roll into a lab technician job or a teaching job at a community college. SIUC has also been encouraged to develop a fee paying terminal degree within Psychology. The department saw this as an opportunity to make the undergraduate degree program more attractive with the opportunity for an MS after. This could increase the number of fee paying MS students and provide a mechanism for PhDs who wish to get out of the program.

W Calvert first reading of "Resolution in Support of the Online M.B.A. Concentration in Analytics."

J Shapiro clarified that in the RME, it is written that all additional teaching required for new courses in the program will be taught by faculty on a voluntary overload basis, and that all new courses will be dependent on that voluntary overload. He said he would like to hear more about that, suggesting that there is the possibility that no faculty will agree to the overload.

M Peterson responded that since he had been Dean, the College had offered 26 sections, 20 of which were taught on overload from faculty in the College of Business, 3 of which were taught with other faculty at SIUC, and 3 of which were outsourced. So there is a small chance that no faculty in the College of Business will agree to teach on overload. However, M Peterson said that he has spoken with one faculty that would be willing to teach all sections. There is also the possibility that faculty could retire, resign, or separate from SIUC. At this time, it is hard to hire new faculty, yet there is a mechanism in place to outsource if the need arises. It is a small risk, but the University does have options.

S Lahiri asked what outsourcing meant.

M Peterson answered that the current policy mandates an internal search first for faculty to teach sections on overload basis. Most of the time this works out. Failing an internal search, the college creates an advertisement to look externally for instructors. A committee is formed to determine who would be best to teach which courses.

S Lahiri followed up, asking if qualifications for those external hires are the same.

M Peterson answered yes, that it is important that we have qualified faculty for our graduate courses so as not to run afoul of accreditation.

T Velasco asked if these people were PhDs

M Peterson said that in most cases they are but that he did not want to commit to that. He did believe that all those currently teaching online courses have terminal degrees.

T Velasco asked to clarify that everyone that teaches these courses has to have graduate status, which implies a PhD.

M Peterson said that was correct.

D DiLalla suggested saying instead of “outsourcing” that the University would use “competitive searches,” and instead of saying “voluntary overload” that faculty would be teaching on “voluntary compensated overload”.

Y Lee said that according to the Graduate School, if someone is needed to teach a graduate course, a request must be sent to him first.

T Clark added that the analytics initiative is a forward looking investment. He said that he does not believe that the world will always stay so resource poor. Analytics is all across the academy and all across the world of business. In other words, the College of Business knows that there is a hot market currently for business graduates with analytics capabilities. He said that though we cannot staff it at the moment, if we do not get this going, we will be behind in the market. It will benefit the University to have this as soon as possible so as to recruit using the buzzword “analytics”.

S Lahiri asked what analytics was.

T Clark said that it involves big data application.

N Carver clarified that faculty in the Computer Sciences had a problem with the original proposal and that it was determined that the College of Business would not be teaching Math or Computer Sciences elements.

T Clark said that the College of Business has neither the capabilities, nor the interest to do so.

N Carver added that this is for MBAs to understand the terminology.

T Clark said that on the Business end, we deal only with predictive analytics. We do not have the architecture or databases to do Math and Computer Sciences based analytics. We dashboard for managers that are not technical but who need to make decisions.

W Calvert asked then that this was for managers.

N Carver said yes and that course descriptions say that this is not a highly technical course.

T Clark suggested that with this we might see cross-campus collaborations in the future.

N Carver said that Computer Sciences is putting forward an RME shortly for a Data Sciences Masters, which already has 4 faculty researchers for.

T Clark added that we now have a Research Center for Statics and that he and others are forming a board to run it. Its members include the top people from Nike, Edward Jones, the Chicago Merc., and Presence Health (among others).

S Lahiri asked that if all that was needed was a PhD to teach these courses, can those with cross-disciplinary degrees teach them.

D DiLalla responded that an "analysis," in HLC language, would be conducted to see whether a faculty member is qualified to teach the educational content of a given course.

J Flowers clarified that this RME intends to add a concentration in the application of big data to business and that we are not talking about creating instruments, doing complicated math, doing anything but applying existing tools in the business setting

M Peterson said that that was a fair summarization.

T Velasco added that it is a concentration.

K Stickers asked how this proposal relates to the current program with 2 concentrations currently in finance and management.

M Peterson responded that online, an Agribusiness Economics Concentration is offered in what is referred to as a plain vanilla foundation of the traditional MBA. In residential programs, we offer those other concentrations.

K Stickers said that it was not clear how the online programs relate to other programs. He asked if these are separate concentrations.

M Peterson answered that this was correct. This will include four courses taught over 2 years and would be 12 hours of the MBA curriculum.

K Stickers said that he is more familiar with analytics in finance. He asked if analytics more broadly cuts across all of the disciplines in the Business School.

T Clark replied that the reason we want to add this to the online MBA and not the undergraduate degree is because we are in the budget crisis and could not afford to staff it up on campus right now. In the future, the College of Business would like to incorporate it backward into the undergraduate program. He added that the market for plain vanilla MBAs is saturated and that most business schools are adding specializations of various kinds.

Educational Policies Committee: Jennifer Lynn Smith

J Lynn Smith first reading of "Resolution in Support of a Modification of the Policy Allowing for the Exemption of the TOEFL Requirement"

Y Lee pointed out a typo in the resolution.

R Whaley indicated that she had two questions. The first was about the language of "regardless of when the exam was taken." She wanted to know if that included "expired."

Y Lee said that here we are only talking about those students that have taken the test elsewhere. Nothing, he said, changes except a reduction in the number of transfer credits from an accredited university. So if it is expired, we cannot take it into consideration.

R Whaley responded that the "regardless of when the exam was taken" language should remain.

N Carver said "yes," that that was the important part.

Y Lee said that he had discussed removing this language with his office.

N Carver asked then what the point of this was. He added that the problem in Computer Sciences is that somebody gets an MA somewhere and applies to the program and their exam is expired and then they have to go retake it. They say that it is not worth retaking, so they go elsewhere. If we are not going to change that then he wondered why even have a resolution.

Y Lee said that he thinks N Carver has a good point. He said that lets say they get a master's degree from another university. We should honor that in this case.

N Carver said he told the committee that a number of students apply to the program where they are told they have to retake the exam. Not a single one has retaken it and instead went elsewhere. They feel like they have passed the exam and have a master's degree and are then being told their English is not trusted. He thinks that this should be up to the department to decide, not the Graduate School.

J Lynn Smith made clear that they removed the part about having to show the score, wondering if it was really necessary. As far as timing, the original language says that they have had to take the TOEFL and presented the scores prior to beginning a program at another university.

Y Lee said that the issue was clarified.

T Haniotakis added that we should be careful with the scores that we require of people. In Computer Engineering there are good students with high scores on the GRE, top percentiles, but they cannot come because their TOEFL is lower than our requirement. The English Department may need this, but for us, it shouldn't be as high of a standard. If a student scores highly on the GRE, we should have an exception

for the TOEFL. We tell these people to take the TOEFL again, and they say yea right and go to another university. So this needs to be taken into account. Maybe give them some flexibility if they have other qualifications.

N Carver replied that this really is what this is. This is giving more flexibility to departments, which are not forced to accept someone.

T Haniotakis restated that he was suggesting lowering the TOEFL if other requirements are highly met.

N Carver said that that was a different issue than this one.

J Lynn Smith added that this is a good point in relation to the expired TOEFL score. She said that in the past she has had to write many letters of exception. She wonders why write letters of exception when we can change policy.

N Carver reiterated that it makes more sense to let the departments decide.

J Flowers provided a graduate prospective. He said this causes consistent headaches for international students wishing to attend this Institution, especially those that have MAs and have done exceptional research elsewhere and are incensed to have to retake the TOEFL when they have already demonstrated their abilities to do Master's work. Another issue is that other institutions sometimes have difficulty in providing proper documentation of the TOEFL exam prior to admission. He had 3 students in his office recently trying to convince him to figure out a way to get their TOEFL scores here. He couldn't do it because of institutional bureaucracy. Any resolution would be a boon to the international student community. He generally doesn't care how it is done, but he asks that the international graduate students be involved in the resolution process.

Y Lee said that in the past few years, the Graduate School received many letters of exception from departments. If it is a common problem, then we need to address it. That is why after examining the cases, this policy should be changed. If anyone has noticed other similar problems, please bring them to his attention.

R Whaley indicated that the same issue has just come up with the GREs. She had an excellent applicant with an expired GRE score. At this point, she said we are telling them that to be nominated for the fellowship they must retake the GRE. She continued, saying that whatever the plans were for the resolution that the graduate directors in programs should be consulted.

J Lynn Smith acknowledged that this was a good recommendation.

J Lynn Smith first reading of the "Resolution in Support of a Reduction in the Number of Graded Credit-Hour Requirement for Accelerated Master's Programs.

N Carver said that this resolution is really fixing an oversight in the catalogue that should have been fixed last year.

J Flowers asked if anyone has looked at the way that the accelerated master's programs interact with the catalogue language.

N Carver responded that there were some issues in the guidelines passed last year. There is some specific language that talked about the double major, for example. This is just amending the 21 hour language. If it doesn't fully fix the issue, we need to figure it out.

Y Lee added that last year there was an issue about 9 hours being double counted and the 21 hours being out of the 30 hours required.

N Carver said that a specific sentence change to the catalogue makes sense.

Research Committee: Sajal Lahiri

S Lahiri said that the committee is discussing two issues with visiting scholars. There has been a proposal from the patent office for them to sign an agreement. We did meet as a group and have many questions, which have only just been answered in a long email. The committee will evaluate those comments at the next meeting. In regards to tuition and grants, J Garvey gave the committee a report; the committee has decided to take no actions at the moment in this regard.

Review Committee: Sue Rimmer

S Rimmer said that the committee was tasked with finding 8 internal reviewers for programs in chemistry, physics, geology and engineering. They have come up with 6 so far. This list was approved and forwarded to the Provost's office. The committee is closing in on the last two.

Report from GPSC: Clay Awsumb

C Awsumb announced that the town hall being organized is not going forward but is being replaced by the October 19th event. Also, campus wide committees have been filled. Those committees have begun work with GPSC on increasing mental health on campus, mentorship opportunities, and programs for graduate and professional development. Additionally GPSC voted on a motion to change exam schedules at the Faculty Senate meeting. Along with Dean Lee and the Graduate Council, GPSC is looking into hosting a symposium to promote mentorship. A framework for mentorship for faculty is also being put together.

T Velasco said that it was his understanding that it was going back to the research committee.

S Lahiri said that the resolution is clear on how to interpret the issue and establish a framework for mentorship.

T Velasco said he would be sending an email to the Provost's Office to establish how they plan to implement the resolution from the administrative perspective.

S Lahiri said that most of the proposal was about implementation.

Y Lee added that the Graduate School organized a symposium on mentorship and is inviting recent graduate faculty awardees to share their experience with the undergraduate faculty and students as one way to help promote an atmosphere of mentorship.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 AM