

2018 Graduate Council

Meeting Minutes

March 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, Trish McCubbin, Derrick McDowell, Marc Morris, Julie Partridge, Lauran Schaefer, Joseph Shapiro, Jennifer Lynn Smith, Kenneth Stickers, Tomás Velasco, and Rachel Whaley.

Members Absent: Buffy Ellsworth (proxy Kanako Hayashi), Sue Rimmer, and Greg Rose.

Proxies: Johnathan Flowers for Derrick McDowell and Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies.

Ex-Officio: Lizette Chevalier, David DiLalla, Ahmad Fakhoury, James Garvey, and Juliane Wallace.

Guests: David Johnson

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

Consideration of Minutes

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes for the meeting held 1 February, 2018—20 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstain. The minutes passed.

- **Remarks—Acting in Capacity of Co-Provosts David DiLalla and Lizette Chevalier**

L Chevalier opened the floor to questions

D DiLalla said that his office was currently preparing provost level sabbatical letters and was also planning to communicate promotion and tenure letters according to standard timelines, roughly March.

S Lahiri asked how enrollment looked.

D DiLalla said he did not have the current numbers in front of him.

J Shapiro asked if the co-provosts could speak to the next phase of reorganization with respects to timeline. He added that at one point plans were anticipated to have been reviewed and voted on by the April meeting.

D DiLalla said that he was working with the Board and the President's office to understand what the Board does and does not vote on. That formal RMEs would be voted on in April was unlikely, but he added that he was keeping the Board updated.

S Lahiri asked if it were likely that the new school structure would be in place for fall 2019.

D DiLalla said he wouldn't speculate on timeline but that the Chancellor had indicated he would like us to move as quickly as possible.

S Lahiri then asked if changes to the organizational structure needed to be approved by the Board.

D DiLalla said we would do what the board requires.

S Lahiri followed up by asking what school or department he would be in in the fall.

J Lynn Smith asked if college proposals would move separately.

D DiLalla said that those proposals were independent and that college level naming would need to be shown to the President's office and the IBHE.

J Lynn Smith responded that the proposed college of the Social Sciences, Humanities, Media, and Arts (SCHMA) was working on proposals and would want to weigh in on the process.

D DiLalla said he thought that that was a college level discussion and that because of the uncertainty moving forward, the assumption would be that work-load and teaching for 2018-19 would be status quo.

L Chevalier commented that though RME was used to reference proposals for new degree programs, new degree program proposals were actually New Unit of Instruction proposals (NUIs). RMEs are for changes for existing programs.

L Schaefer asked if departments would get to vote on the names of the new colleges.

D DiLalla answered that he was not saying that, but that his office would follow the college operating paper guidelines and past practice with the processing of those RMEs.

L Schaefer followed up, asking how it would work if there were not yet new operating papers for the new colleges.

D DiLalla answered that we would process documents under existing operating papers, and to do otherwise would be immobilizing. There are a variety of ways to approach the issue of operating papers.

L Schaefer asked if there was the possibility that those involved in departments would not have a say in the renaming.

D DiLalla said that they would look at what the operating papers obligated regarding input from constituency groups.

J Lynn Smith asked if a college proposal is an RME.

L Chevalier said that if it is renaming then yes.

J Lynn Smith then asked if unit changes were RMEs

L Chevalier said yes if it is an element of a college that is being built upon.

R Whaley asked if affected people in those colleges would then vote in that RME process.

L Chevalier referenced the curricular guide form.

D DiLalla said that curricular level change originates in departments and that the department level curriculum committee had to vote on such changes. He added that at an organizational level, the RME process is used.

R Whaley said that she was concerned with college proposals going forward before school plans have been resolved. She clarified that we do not know what are in those colleges.

D DiLalla suggested that there had to be an organizational structure in place first in which to house new approved academic units.

C Awsumb asked about administrative changes versus policy changes. He then asked if there were any alterations to the assignment of graduate students as instructors of record. He asked for D DiLalla to explain why the instructor of record issue was administrative and not policy related.

D DiLalla said he would not get into labor relations and how the university assigns employees.

C Awsumb asked if he should assume then that graduate students would not be assigned as instructors of record.

D DiLalla said he was not willing to make that assumption. He was working on cases by department.

C Awsumb then asked who graduate students go to with question about the future delivery of course content.

D DiLalla answered, school directors.

K Jones stated that all hiring takes place in the department. She then referenced the new hiring system, higher touch, and problems with navigating and using it.

D DiLalla said that the advantage of the new system was that it moves employees through the system from hiring to the HR database. He added that the rollout occurred in such a way that we should revisit training. He thought that once it was implemented fully, it would make our collective lives easier.

K Jones suggested that before August, training should be offered.

D DiLalla said the software was working well in some places and not in others, and that units should contact his office with concerns.

R Whaley then asked about what parts of the Graduate Council's role in the reorganization process the Board would need to see. She said that she thought the President said in the fall that the IBHE would see the trail of votes and other documents and that they should be in the Board minutes.

L Chevalier said that her office was keeping apprised of what the Board and IBHE would need.

K Jones asked about the hiring status of an enrollment manager.

L Chevalier responded that the process was actively open.

D DiLalla said that the initial hiring pool was not very deep or strong, so the university was in consultation with the hiring firm to expand and strengthen the next hiring pool.

- **Remarks—Interim Vice-Chancellor James Garvey**

J Garvey opened the floor for questions.

W Calvert commented on the fact that two co-provosts and a vice-chancellor had no formal remarks.

D DiLalla said that the semester was largely focused on reorganization, so he sensed that questions would go there anyway.

L Chevalier agreed that by opening the floor, she let the Council members prioritize the discussion.

W Calvert thought that was fair.

S Lahiri asked if the co-provosts were paying attention to enrollment.

D DiLalla said they were.

L Schaefer asked about the idea going around that G.A. funding might be split between T.A.s and R.A.s and that faculty would need to apply for guaranteed funding for research assistants.

J Garvey answered that that was all speculative. He said that there are funds for supporting G.A.s in two places: the colleges where the deans decide allocation, and the Graduate School where the graduate Dean decides allocation. He added that the Chancellor is talking about adding some graduate research assistantships, but it is not clear where the funding would come for those yet.

L Schaefer asked if the Vice-Chancellor could talk about plans to enhance the graduate research enterprise.

J Garvey said that if we are to reach toward R1 status, graduate education at the PhD level needed to be focused on.

L Schaefer then asked for a research center overview under the Vice-Chancellor's purview.

J Garvey answered that research was considerably down; two years ago, the University brought in \$76 million and last year \$36 million. He said that we are tracking the same as last year, between \$36-40 million. He added that clinical trial money was down but that faculty were still submitting proposals for grants at a high level. Success rates vary from year to year.

L Schaefer followed up asking about start-up funds and attracting new high-research capacity faculty.

J Garvey answered that two sources for startups were state allocations and overhead. There is still some money to make commitments for future hires. He did say that SIUC was at a critical period and needed to invest in new research in response to a concerning pattern in external support. He added that it has traditionally been the role of the Graduate Council to enhance and protect research and that the body would need to be involved in the process. He said that there were grants to be sought after as well as resources in industry. His office was also working with the Foundation to look into additional resources.

S Lahiri asked whether the reduction in funding was coming from the state or federal level.

J Garvey responded that there were several factors. The School of Medicine, he added, appears to be divesting from NIH level research. There are not as many researchers going for research grants but more going for clinical money.

S Lahiri asked if this was just on the Carbondale campus.

J Garvey suggested SIUC should move away from reliance on state money as the State does not want to pay for overhead, administrative costs, and fringe benefits rates. He added that in some cases, state projects become losing propositions for the University. Resources should be focused on the research component at the University.

S Lahiri asked about the status of research money.

J Garvey responded that it had stayed relatively stable but that there has still been an impact on overhead.

S Lahiri asked if startup funds come from the state level.

J Garvey said that roughly half of startup funds come from state funds and half from indirect funds. He said that roughly \$2.5 million in startups is invested back in the faculty each year.

At this time (38:57), a malfunction in the recording device's internal storage caused the device to stop recording. The remainder of the minutes will be transcribed from notes.

L Schaefer noted a need to involve graduate students in these discussions.

J Garvey said that a course for graduate students was being considered which would allow for discussion. He thought that this course could be important for research integrity.

N Carver said that RMEs would reflect the cost of proposed programs and would be made available to everyone.

J Lynn Smith added that in the humanities, faculty had not even seen money to cover the cost of conferences.

J Garvey said that in the past roughly \$100,000 a year had been allocated for these events and similar professional development. He hoped to provide for the arts and humanities in this capacity for the next fiscal year.

C Awsumb reminded the Council that it was important to keep GPSC involved in the process.

S Hart asked how we could help the Foundation.

J Garvey suggested that we needed to develop relationships with industry because it is there that the large grants are secured and not through the foundation.

S Hart followed up, asking about alumni outreach to support faculty needs.

L Schaefer noted that there was a lot of focus on STEM support; she asked about supporting humanities.

J Garvey answered that the two biggest funds come from medicine/education and human services. He added that the National Endowment of the Arts often required fund matching which can be difficult to do when funds are tight.

W Babcock asked if there was a correlation between reorganization and the budget issues. He noted that the past two universities that the Chancellor had been hired at underwent massive reorganization with limited budgetary improvements. He said this was the concern of a lot of the faculty.

D DiLalla answered that budget would largely be impacted by enrollment and the State.

S Lahiri followed up asking about the long-term projections and neglecting enrollment in the short term.

T Shaw then asked about a forecast for cuts to the budget.

D DiLalla said that it was too early for that and that his office was working with enrollment projections and watching the numbers.

J Garvey said that the University would be working with a conservative budget and reiterated that much of the budget questions would be answered by the State's budget.

T Shaw speculated asking if we could expect a 5% cut.

K Jones then asked about the borrowing payback plan for SIUE.

D DiLalla said that the University had made good on its debt to SIUE and that it had paid the first year on its debt to the School of Medicine.

K Jones followed up asking, in reorganization, who would get the bill for that debt.

D DiLalla said that expenditures would remain in units.

W Babcock asked if there was a fiscal exigency plan. He added that the situation seemed worse than a year ago.

D DiLalla said that a financial emergency plan had not been discussed.

J Garvey repeated that the President has indicated a conservative budget for the fall.

S Lahiri asked if the University was paying \$3.8 million to the School of Medicine per year.

D DiLalla said that that payment was across the whole system.

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

J Wallace said that there had been a 5% increase in applications and a 7% increase in admittance in the graduate school compared to this time in Spring 2017. The PhD applications were similar to Spring 2017, however, and admissions were down from 42 to 33. She then announced that the Graduate School had hired a new Assistant Dean, Dr. Rose Moroz. She added that the Graduate Council elections would be taking place soon. There would be three constituency groups involved and nominating ballots would be out the following week. She said that the Graduate Catalogue was being heavily proofed as well. She concluded that with the Higher Touch issues, it would take up to a week to process graduate assistantship.

K Jones asked if constituencies could offer feedback on Higher Touch considering that there had been months of struggling with it.

R Whaley noted that there were problems with the Radius App system as well. She asked if there would be training during the academic year as training in the summer was not practical.

J Wallace referenced the forthcoming Graduate School newsletter, which would have information about Radius simplified on it.

K Stickers asked what he should tell students about the cross-disciplinary aims of the reorganization. He then asked about graduate student support in this regard.

J Wallace said that the key discussion will be how to facilitate interdisciplinary work without taking anything from the programs.

K Stickers asked who the contact would be for questions.

J Wallace said herself.

D McDowell said that the Law School was focused already on interdisciplinary partnerships through their various journals. He suggested this would be helpful to think about.

J Lynn Smith asked about the status of master's with double majors.

J Wallace said that there were only a small number of concurrent degrees and could be discussed case by case.

L Schaefer asked if J Wallace could speak to the fact that SIUC female enrollment was 10% behind the national average and enrollment of women of color was 8 % behind.

J Wallace answered that this was a system-wide problem and needed a system-wide solution to better serve underrepresented student populations.

L Schaefer asked if enrollment numbers were available for all populations.

J Wallace answered yes and added that overwhelmingly the numbers show a need for mentoring and a desire for workshops and events. Of the latter, some have been planned in a series for the spring.

S Lahiri mentioned the Research Committee's work with a resolution for mentoring minority, tenure-track faculty.

W Calvert added that the Provost had asked the committee to draw up a plan for what that would look like.

L Schaefer reiterated why she has taken the initiative for mentoring on campus.

T Haniotakis asked if L Schaefer could explain further.

L Schaefer said that research shows that women and underrepresented groups desire but are not offered sufficient mentorship. Traditionally, women are underserved in this regard, so there is a need for a formalized program to assure quality mentorship for women and underrepresented populations at SIUC.

J Garvey noted some similar initiatives with NSF and the 1 Million Project both of which are committed to mentoring in STEM fields and increasing diversity.

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

L Chevalier said that the main focus was reorganization and that her office was dealing with issues therein.

T Velasco asked about the status of the Digital Catalogue.

L Chevalier said that the University would be using an adobe product and that web communications was working on a shell.

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

T Velasco reported that because of low interest in the original speed-networking event at SIUE, it was to be postponed until April 6, 2018. SIUE has received a grant to pay for transportation for SIUC faculty. Research-oriented PhDs in health-related fields are welcome to attend and contribute. He then directed the Council to a handout distributed via email with details. He asked that those interested contact him.

- **Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Update, Julie Partridge**

J Partridge reported that the University had received a date for the HLC on-site visit—February 2020. She said that soon a climate survey would be disseminated to all on campus. She added that the subcommittees had been working on assurance arguments and would be getting those to the steering committee where drafts would be reviewed.

L Schaefer asked if the committees had been meeting.

J Partridge said that hers had.

M Brown said that there had been communication between individual committee members

L Schaefer said that if an extra graduate student would be wanted for the HLC then GPSC would need to know.

D McDowell referred to the speed-networking comments, indicating that the Law School published journals that were cross-disciplinary (e.g. legal medicine) and could be useful for considering how to conduct speed-networking in the future.

- **Faculty Association Update, David Johnson.**

D Johnson reported that the administration had processed Article IX documents and that the contract does not specify when faculty had to move forward with the process. He added that six schools had received extensions on proposals. He then referenced the CBA, describing administrative and faculty functions therein. He also clarified the issue with the title “departments,” describing it as one about having Basic Academic Units (BAUs) within other BAUs. The issue was with chair and director responsibilities in such a situation.

T McCubbin asked for clarification that the contract did not allow for BAUs to be housed in other BAUs. She asked whether this was because of possible problems with operating paper conflict.

K Jones asked if the Faculty Association had insight into the role of chairs. She then followed up asking if chairs functioned as part of the administration in the CBA.

J Lynn Smith asked if the Faculty Association made a distinction between counter proposals and separate proposals

D Johnson said there was no specific terminology in the CBA, but that it was generally understood that a counter proposal was a proposed change to an existing proposal.

D DiLalla added that proposal changes would involve a proposed modification, revision, or provision and that a new proposal would fall under the article IX process.

S Lahiri asked if reorganization and the legal problems with the definition of “departments” could be avoided if a different word than “departments” was used.

D Johnson guessed that that would be a contractual matter.

S Lahiri said that the Chancellor had said that he wanted to get rid of departments because of the contracts. He then asked again why the word “department” couldn’t be changed while maintaining the department function.

T Velasco commented that there was a specific legal definition of “department”.

D DiLalla said that the problem with nested BAUs was the reason why schools and departments cannot coexist. This was a part of the CBA.

S Lahiri asked more broadly what the purpose of reorganization was.

D DiLalla said that the purpose for reorganization had been given in prior meetings.

L Schaefer said that that CBA discussion was rooted in the December 7th Graduate Council minutes.

S Lahiri asked to clarify that the administration’s hands were tied by contractual structures of the CBA regarding operating papers.

J Shapiro noted that a reason given for the reorganization was that it would save \$2.3 million on administrative costs. He asked for arguments and evidence other than that for carrying out a reorganization.

D DiLalla said that the money saving was not the only reason for the reorganization.

S Lahiri again asked what the reason for reorganization was. He then asked if interdisciplinary study was one of the reasons. He added that as academics, he and his colleagues would want to discuss how reorganization would be carried out and what the best models were.

D DiLalla said that one aim was to create an administrative structure that allowed for easier interdisciplinary cooperation.

W Calvert called for a point of order, citing time and other points for consideration on the agenda.

J Lynn Smith asked about the procedure for revising proposals.

D Johnson said that the contract did not address disciplinary centers. He added that there was some misunderstanding between what the CBA had to do and could not do. He added that the Faculty Association was sponsoring a collaboration event on March 6th in Pulliam, similar to the speed-networking for research.

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

No Report

- **Report—Faculty Senate, Ahmad Fakhoury**

A Fakhoury reported that three resolutions had been approved in the prior meeting: Resolution to Recommend the Proposed Program Reviewers for University Honors Program, Resolution to Recommend Approval of the RME to Eliminate the Certificate in Histotechnology in the School of Medicine, and Resolution Calling on the Legislature and the Governor to Provide Stable Funding for Higher Education.

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

First Reading: Resolution in Support of Changes to the Graduate School’s Academic Grievances Policy/Procedures

J Partridge listed proposed changes the Grievance policy/ procedure.

Reports from Standing Committees:

- **New Programs Committee, Wesley Calvert**

First Reading: Resolution in support of the elimination of the post-baccalaureate Certificate in Histotechnology

W Calvert submitted the resolution for consideration as written.

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

First Reading: Resolution Requiring a Letter of Concurrence in the Creation of New Graduate Specializations

First Reading: [Resolution on Graduate Council Procedure on Article 9 Proposals .pdf](#)

W Calvert described the resolution and suggested a suspension of Robert's Rules to vote on the resolution after a first reading.

S Lahiri asked about the differences between NIUs and RMEs

R Whaley said that it was important to have procedures in place as soon as possible and going forward.

T Velasco said that he would like to read the resolution a second time with proposed changes.

- Changes to the resolution were recommended and are now reflected in the resolution.
- Motion to suspend Robert's Rules, passed: Yes-16, No-0, and Abstain-0.
- Vote on amended resolution, passed: Yes-16, No-0, and Abstain-0.
- Motion to reinstate Robert's Rules, passed: Yes-16, No-0, and Abstain-0.

- o **Research Committee Report, Sajal Lahiri**

No Report

- o **Program Review Committee, Sue Rimmer (proxy Rachel Whaley)**

No Report

- o **Report from GPSC, Clay Awsumb**

C Awsumb reported that GPSC had recently passed a vote of no confidence in the Chancellor. He added that J Wallace had met with GPSC representatives and the meeting was productive. He said that the GPSC would continue to emphasize student perspectives in relation to reorganization, and he encouraged everyone to stop by the WGSS conference to be held the following day.

Adjournment:

The Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 10:34 AM.