

2018 Graduate Council

Meeting Minutes

February 1, 2018

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

Members Absent: Trish McCubbin and Greg Rose

Proxies: Kanako Hayashi for Buffy Ellsworth and Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies.

Ex-Officio: Terry Clark, David DiLalla, Grant Miller, Carlo Montemagno, Juliane Wallace.

Guests: None

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:05 AM.

Consideration of Minutes

T **Haniotakis** requested the word “some” be added to page 5, paragraph 3, before the word “scholarships” so as to read “...we have some scholarships for them.”

Graduate Council members voted to approve the amended minutes for the meeting held 7 December 2017—21 in favor, 0 opposed. The minutes passed.

- **Remarks—Chancellor Carlo Montemagno**

Chancellor Montemagno said that the reorganization was moving forward and that he had met with all of the proposed schools except one, which he would meet with that afternoon. Then he would have met with all of the faculty on campus. He indicated that he was excited about moving to the next phase of the reorganization plan in which the University could envision its future as a leading institution for the twenty-first century.

T **Shaw** asked about the ongoing herpes research investigation and its effect on HLC accreditation.

C **Montemagno** responded that the School of Medicine was considered part of the SIUC organization and that an answer to T Shaw’s question would depend on the NIH ruling and review panel activities. He said that he was not sure whether the findings would affect accreditation.

- **Remarks—Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost David DiLalla**

D **DiLalla** said he was still working on Provost-level sabbatical approvals. He added that promotion and tenure review were continuing and that his office was on target for notifying faculty around spring break. Promotion and tenure workshops for administrators and faculty should be announced in April.

C **Awsumb** asked about the previously mentioned analysis of undergraduate and graduate course offerings, enrollment statistics, and cataloguing of courses.

D **DiLalla** answered that the curricular side of the co-Provost responsibilities resided in the APAP office and that he would follow up with L Chevalier.

R Whaley commented that L Chevalier had said she found 1500 courses in the catalogue that had not been taught in at least six years.

C Awsumb then asked about the process for program changes in relation to article IX and whether proposed unit relocations would affect program change timeline procedures.

D DiLalla responded that the 90 day dialogue window was meant to support the possibility of discussion, modification, and revision in an active process. He added that updated proposals do not reset the timeline but that modification was built into the dialogue window.

C Awsumb asked to clarify that the start date for the 90 day window was the date on the original proposal.

D DiLalla answered that it was not so much the date on proposal but the date it was distributed to faculty.

C Awsumb clarified that it was then the effective date of the distribution to all parties.

J Shapiro asked whether there had been new proposals since the first wave of proposals, ones that would start new clocks.

D DiLalla responded that there had been two to date and one forthcoming to propose new schools that had not been previously proposed. A new proposal clock began for these.

S Lahiri asked how “modification” versus “new” was defined.

D DiLalla said this was defined in section 9.05 of the contract, reiterating that the 90 day timeline was to be a fluid process between faculty and administration.

J Lynn Smith then asked if counterproposals went through processing along with A9 documents.

D DiLalla said it depended on whether what was submitted was a consideration for modification of an existing proposal or whether it was a new independent proposal from a unit.

J Lynn Smith followed up, asking what the COLA council role was in the process.

D DiLalla said that contract provisions for college-level curricular review boards hinged on whether a constituency group was tasked with the review of proposals. Curricular change through RME to modify programs is under the domain of the COLA council.

S Rimmer asked if, with the changes, there was a critical mass for which a school could not function, say if a larger program leaves a proposed school.

D DiLalla said that there was no established threshold and that they would work case-by-case.

W Calvert asked if there were a faculty support threshold below which a unit was no longer considered viable.

D DiLalla said that the process recognizes faculty recommendations for proposals and that there was no formal threshold.

L Schaefer referred to recent hire to promote the arts, noting that a promotion of the arts required that faculty responsibility not be over-extended. She asked, with changes to departmental fiduciary responsibilities that require faculty to take on more service, in what ways the administration was

planning, through hiring, to assure that new responsibilities were carried out without faculty being overextended.

D DiLalla said he was not prepared to talk about hiring then but could in future meetings.

C Awsumb asked whether school change proposals could be executed through RMEs or whether they would be determined by the IBHE and the units of instruction.

D DiLalla said they would coordinate closely with IBHE to assure we do what is required.

C Awsumb asked if part of the proposal process would be ongoing conversation with the IBHE.

D DiLalla said that would be premature because they had yet to receive recommendations from the review process. He added that some reconnaissance with the IBHE was done, but that it would be appropriate to know what was being proposed to understand responsibilities with respect to all bodies.

J Maddox thanked D DiLalla for helping to get the Law School G.A.s and T.A.s paid. She then asked for an update on the Law Library being open 24/7.

C Montemagno said he was looking at not only opening the Law Library but Morris as well.

- **Remarks—Interim Associate Dean & Director of the Graduate School Julian P. Wallace**

J Wallace reported that spring enrollment was down 7% and that enrollment numbers by program could be given upon request. CGS and NSF surveys indicated international graduate enrollment overall was down 5.5%; SIUC, she said, was down 10%. The Graduate School was processing fellowships and scholarships. The number of applications was also down. J Wallace said she hoped to be concluding interviews for the Assistant Dean position and noted that the Graduate School would be participating in this year's "Day of Giving". Other initiatives involved enrollment and how to serve graduate students better. She added that graduate program reviews were ongoing. She has received feedback from faculty reviewers that could be useful to the Council as a lot of good information comes from them. She indicated that one consistent question reviewers have asked was regarding GA funding. She then asked about the aforementioned ad hoc committee to address graduate teaching.

J Partridge said they were in the process of forming the committee membership and that was as far as the committee had gotten.

G Miller said that no line item for the Executive Faculty Senate meeting existed; he could not comment.

J Wallace said that it was important for that committee to move forward with Faculty Senate.

J Lynn Smith referenced an article in the *NYT* on international education that showed that Tier 2 Midwest universities were losing the most international students to R1 universities. This could account for SIUC's apparent drop. She also mentioned the extent of Graduate School red tape for western European students attending SIUC.

L Schaefer said she was working on a proposal for creating mentoring groups on campus. One impetus for said proposal is the marginalization of international students and the lack of mentoring advisors for them. She then asked if the Graduate School had resources to continue to work on a mentoring program university-wide or if J Wallace could talk about what resources would be needed for it.

J Wallace said that there was not currently the resources and that she did not know how much would be needed. She said that there was a need for a campus-wide approach to taking care of students and that she was establishing those relationships with CIE, CESL, etc.

K Jones asked about mandatory reporting of G.A. hours and the concern international students had about reporting and visa requirements.

D DiLalla answered that if the process brought to light these issues, it was a good thing. Students, he said, are obligated to work the hours they are contracted to work, 20 hours on 50% FTE.

L Schaefer suggested that international students are sometimes required to work more than 20 hours. She asked who was responsible for reviewing hours and making sure students are not asked to work more than they are required, if there was a process for department chairs to bring issues to the administration.

D DiLalla responded that that was the mechanism. He emphasized that SIUC had never tolerated people being asked to work more than they were contracted to. The chair/director would assess patterns in units and work to enhance the process.

L Schaefer asked if directors evaluated time logs before they reached the Graduate School.

D DiLalla said it was a work in progress and that the GAU had shown interest in bargaining in this implementation.

L Schaefer expressed concern that chairs might modify hours before sending them to the Graduate School.

D DiLalla said that with GAU bargaining, there was mention of online time log mechanisms. This could help with concerns about fidelity of records. He is discussing web portals with IT.

D McDowell asked if there were plans to advertise and increase enrollment for the Law School.

J Wallace said that an "Enrollment Task Force" was important going forward, and the question is, where recruitment lies, with the Graduate School or departments. She added that the Graduate School should help all programs recruit through the use of media and the Graduate School website. She suggested the idea of a competition among programs to utilize promotional flash drives with SIU logos on them. Programs can put information they want on these flash drives and distribute them to prospective students. She said that the University was beyond its need for printed recruitment materials.

K Jones mentioned the "Graduate Enrollment Working Group" that brought together people to discuss ideas related to recruitment. She asked if J Wallace had an interest in reconstituting it.

Sheena Hart asked whether the Law School had an invitation to email J Wallace.

J Wallace answered yes to both.

C Awsumb asked to whom time sheets should be submitted.

D DiLalla answered that any confusion could be cleared up by chairs/directors, thus making a unit level administrator responsible. He reiterated that the process was ongoing in enhancing efficiency.

C Awsumb asked about the Graduate School FAQs page including submission information.

L Schaefer asked if J Wallace had heard anything from chairs about enrollment in relation to the proposed reorganization.

J Wallace answered that no one had expressed that the reorganization had impacted recruitment any more than anything else at that point.

D DiLalla noted that a past change to the Morris fellowships regarding funding caused a decrease in applications. He also thought it was critical to give faculty the resources to mentor effectively. He had never heard faculty ask for compensation, though, as mentoring is a core responsibility of being faculty.

J Partridge added that there were 7 Morris applications last year and only 1 this year.

R Whaley commented that the PhD fellowship and MA forms have some redundancies that are time consuming for DGSs especially.

J Wallace said that she had found this to be the case throughout the Graduate School.

K Stickers clarified that the issue with the Morris fellowship was that departments were made to commit to continued support after two years; they could not because of budget issues.

D DiLalla said that prior to changes, the fellowship was fully funded for 4 to 5 years. The change was to a 2 and 2 cost share system. He added that this change had a predictable outcome.

L Schaefer expressed that one issue with the fellowships was that people could not hold other paid positions. Not teaching for those 4 to 5 years could limit jobs for those wanting to teach. She added that, in her research, compensation had continually come up as an issue with mentoring. She also wanted to acknowledge that there were differences between what faculty and students considered mentoring.

J Wallace thought that there were good examples of mentorship on campus already.

- **Remarks—Associate Provost for Academic Programs Lizette Chevalier**

No Remarks

- **Report—Council's Chair, Tomás Velasco**

T Velasco referenced a handout distributed to members in regards to the speed-networking event at SIUE on March 2nd, 2018 at 10AM. The event will be on health related research. Individuals will describe their research in five minute with the hopes of afterwards finding synergistic partnerships. SIUE is willing to pay for transportation to the event and those that are interested should let T Velasco know.

C Awsumb asked whether students interested in health related research could attend.

T Velasco said he would ask and let C Awsumb know.

Action Item:

- **Second Reading: Resolution in Support of the Addition of an Accelerated M.A. in History.**

[Graduate Council Resolution in Support of the Addition of an Accelerated MA in History.pdf](#)

T Shaw asked about the minimal anticipated costs referenced in the resolution.

M Brown said there were none in regards to the program itself.

The members voted on the resolution: Yes-21, No-0, and Abstain-0. The resolution passed.

J Shapiro brought up a past resolution against the universal eliminations of departments, asking what happened to that resolution, if it was sent to the Board of Trustees, for example.

T Velasco answered that generally he signed passed resolution which were then sent to the Graduate School and then on to the administration. The implementation of resolutions is dependent upon the administration.

J Shapiro clarified that then the council did not send the resolution to the Board of Trustees. He again asked where resolutions like the one previously passed go.

L Schaefer asked if the council could vote to send it to the Board of Trustees.

W Calvert thought it would be ill-advised to do so at that point. He added that trustees recognize a difference between governance and management and would reckon the original collection of opinions from constituents on campus a management function delegated to officers of the University. He added that it may become a governance issue that the Council would want to communicate directly to the Board. He thought that now the Council would run the risk of being seen as going outside of channels and being a less serious body to deal with.

T Velasco reiterated that the council had passed the resolution, and it was up to the Board and administration to react to the decision.

R Whaley said that any individual can send a memo to the Board expressing their opinions.

W Calvert said that if it appears the Board is making a decision without asking what we think about it, then it could be necessary to directly communicate with them. He presumed the administration would act in good faith and explain to the Board what their constituencies thought. He added that if it is clear that this is not happening, then we could discuss options.

R Whaley added that decisions cannot be made until all of the Article IX processes are complete.

S Lahiri said that the Council had to make sure the Board knew its opinion.

J Lynn Smith asked whether the council would be seeing many more RMEs with reorganization.

D DiLalla said that whatever the Graduate Council guidelines require would be done.

N Carver said that RMEs deal with program changes not administrative organizational changes.

J Lynn Smith noted that a name change alone is an RME.

S Lahiri clarified that programs would be administered at a different level under reorganization.

N Carver said he did not think that that had anything to do with a program RME.

S Rimmer added that she could see in the future there being RMEs for newly formed schools, but that initially it was unlikely.

S Lahiri said clarification was needed in regards to the contract, Article IX, and program changes.

N Carver noted that the constituency was the New Programs Committee and not the New Administrative Units Review Committee.

W Calvert read the contract 9.02, para a., “program change” definition for clarification, adding that the contract identifies program changes including administrative changes of this kind and that the Council operating papers did the same.

S Lahiri said that the contract supersedes everything.

W Calvert said that it probably does but that the Council should make sure that that was the case.

J Shapiro asked whether Faculty Senate would be voting on these program changes.

G Miller said that that was the assumption.

J Shapiro asked whether the Council would vote if appropriate for graduate program changes.

T Velasco said that the Council needed to check the operating papers for what is to be voted on or not.

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

T Clark said that the deans remained positive about the reorganization. He cited a meeting with Edward Jones executives and SIU alum in which the alum were energized by the proposed reorganization. Alum in major corporations had suffered from the budget crises and decline in SIUC’s reputation.

- **Report—Faculty Senate, Grant Miller**

G Miller said the Senate approved the judicial review board chair and vice chair. They voted to approve a Dietetics pre-nursing specialization and approved review committees for the Center of Advanced Coal Research and the Center for Fisheries, Aquaculture, and Aquatic Science.

J Partridge asked if the Council and the Senate would collectively figure out their roles in the process of reorganization and reviewing.

R Whaley thought that the Graduate School would have to rewrite its operating papers.

T Velasco said that changes had been made to the operating papers for the Council but that those changes were never brought to committee to make a resolution for a vote. Changes were posted and implemented though they had not been approved.

J Lynn Smith noted a similar example in Africana studies.

J Wallace said that this was common across campus.

J Lynn Smith asked how many operating papers would have to be written.

J Partridge noted that one operating issue to be addressed would be what representation would look like in Senate and Council with reorganization. There could be major changes.

T Velasco said that this was the reason he had postponed giving the operating papers to the Educational Policy Committee. He was predicating changes to membership and the roles of schools in the Council.

D DiLalla said that the administration does not presume the outcome of the process, but he personally thought it was not useful to take on operating paper questions yet.

G Miller said that the Senate was looking at example operating papers currently. He thought considering examples could be a positive and proactive approach.

T Velasco asked if the Educational Policy Committee would like to find examples.

J Lynn Smith asked if the Senate would share its findings. She said it would be reassuring to know what must be in operating papers.

K Jones said that a list exists of what “shall” be in operating papers.

D DiLalla added that it was important to involve administration in a theoretical proposal process. They should communicate approaches to common issues that the administration would support.

○ **Report—Council’s Vice-Chair, Julie Partridge**

J Partridge asked if a Council member votes to be on the ad hoc committee, whether they could remain the Council representative for that body. Additionally, she spoke with T McCubbin, who did not think that Law School representation was necessary. GPSC and the Medical School could be represented. A resolution on changes to the grievance policy would be slated for the next meeting.

C Awsumb asked about policy changes to “instructor of record” positions. Students who are renewing contracts would like to know policy going forward on GA appointments. He added that a joint committee was a good idea, but that a singular committee might be important considering that Council and Senate have different purposes. A committee should quickly develop its purpose and determine core principles for graduate students and professionals.

J Partridge said she could forward on names of GPSC members wanting on the committee.

G Miller noted that Faculty Senate was not unaware of graduate student issues.

C Awsumb said he wanted the process to continue so graduate students serving as instructors of record could be confident going forward. He asked that both Senate and Council determine basic priorities and communicate them to GPSC.

L Schaefer said GPSC could pick graduate students if the purpose of the committee was clear.

J Partridge said the definition was broad: a working group to explore issues with graduate teaching.

L Schaefer asked if D DiLalla could further comment on issues with “instructor of record” policy.

D DiLalla said he was working case-by-case by department to meet all needs. He added that changes were largely semantic to who would be responsible on Saluki net and in internal record keeping.

L Schaefer thought that this was less semantic for graduate students. She said that the Chancellor was suggesting that graduate students should not get to write their own syllabi.

D DiLalla reiterated that there was a difference between 100 level GA instructors delivering course content developed by faculty and advanced doctoral students teaching courses. The key definitional issue is that “instructors of record” have full and complete authority for all aspects of the course.

R Whaley asked if, with the fall schedule set, there would be possible changes.

D DiLalla said that changes could be made. He added that there was not a lot of disagreement about 100 level courses. What people do on the ground was not changing.

R Whaley asked if there would be department level discussions with the Co-provost considering her department expected to have graduate students teaching in the fall.

D DiLalla invited R Whaley to schedule a meeting with him.

C Awsumb suggested the ad hoc committee coordinate with the Provost's office.

L Schaefer asked that one or two more graduate students be on the committee.

L Partridge responded that the thought was to keep the committee small.

Reports from Standing Committees:

- **New Programs Committee, Wesley Calvert**

No report

- **Educational Policies Committee, Jennifer Lynn Smith**

J Lynn Smith said she pulled the "letter of concurrence" resolution. The Council thought the process was thorough and that a letter was unnecessary. However, the RME form does not ask for a letter, so she was going to add some wording to the RME to make sure that departments using a name that another department already uses consults said department. That RME should be ready at the next meeting.

G Miller asked if that would go to Faculty Senate as well.

J Lynn Smith said she would share with Faculty Senate.

- **Research Committee, Sajal Lahiri**

No report.

- **Program Review Committee, Sue Rimmer**

R Whaley announced that program reviews were ongoing.

- **Report from GPSC, Clay Awsumb**

C Awsumb said that GPSC was compiling a second report on reorganization. The survey of graduate students was moving forward and should be going out to students in 7 to 10 days. Response time will be 2 to 3 weeks. GPSC also approved funding for a Cognitive Sciences event, the Writer's Forum, an Iranian Student Association event, the WGSS conference, and Zoology's "Darwin Week".

J Shapiro asked when faculty would know about request for hire approvals for the fall.

D DiLalla said determinations were largely on hold with a few exceptions because of unexpected departures in CASA and HCM.

R Whaley asked about NTT hires.

D DiLalla said that deans should start working with academic units to submit requests for NTT support for the fall of 2018.

D McDowell asked whether Law School hires would be happening for the fall.

D DiLalla said that the process of hiring NTTs to meet student needs was always ongoing.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45AM.