

2018 Graduate Council

Meeting Minutes

April 5, 2018

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

Members Absent: William Babcock

Proxies: Kanako Hayashi for Buffy Ellsworth, Matt Henning for Sheena Hart, and Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies.

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

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

Consideration of Minutes

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes for the meeting held 1 March, 2018—22 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstain. The minutes passed.

- **Remarks—Chancellor Carlo Montemagno**

C Montemagno said that he was unaware of the content of resolution GG-1 until it was made public the previous Friday. He said that on his blog, he posted his rationale for opposing the resolution, giving a summary of its impact on SIUC and the system. He added that the resolution posed an existential threat to the institution as the first phase asked for 5.125 million to study and that subsequent phases could ask for as much as, if not more than, \$23 million additional. He maintained that there were flaws in the analysis conducted by SIUE, including that it did not take into account all elements of the education SIUC provides and the nature of the organization. He said that the equivalent losses would be equal to that of \$125 million in endowment and that the impact on the local economy would be roughly \$40 million in extraction a year. For SIUC, the result would be a reduction in faculty and NTTs and the closing of departments. He added that he understood SIUE's rationale, but disagreed how the resolution was created and released to constituencies. He said that he had written a formal letter to the President and the Board of Trustees opposing the plan, and a subset of that letter was on his blog. He then shifted to the topic of reorganization. He said that he would be tabling the proposal for a police academy until it could be determined whether the community wanted it. He said that he continues to want to provide a mechanism to move SIUC into the future, including collaborative community efforts, freed up barriers between departments, and additional opportunities to discard irrelevant procedures from the past. He wants a flexible organization designed to meet the needs of the future. He reiterated that he wanted that organization to be ran and governed by the faculty. The most important element of a great university is faculty who take responsibility for and run programs. He then referenced 4 new school proposals being processed in the following week. One of the proposed schools he said that he was excited about was the School of "Creative Arts and Creativity," which could be a distinguishing feature

for SIUC. He mentioned that Eastern Illinois University was looking to SIUC and doing a similar reorganization and that the U of I was also paying attention to SIUC. He concluded that he continued to want to see the faculty and students succeed.

S Rimmer noted that one of the differences between SIUE and is SIUC is that SIUC is a research university. She then cited the resolution which claims that SIUE turns \$2.1 million into \$6.7 million of external funding whereas SIUC turns \$8.8 million into \$15.1 million in external funding. She then asked where those numbers came from?

J Garvey responded that SIUC had produced roughly \$46 million in terms of external federal and industry funding. The rest was state funding. SIUC's production exceeds SIUE's. He encouraged the council to look at the way that SIUE calculates their grant numbers.

S Rimmer asked if part of SIUC's rebuttal would be to question the numbers in the GG resolution.

W Calvert then asked if the Chancellor could comment on political involvement from the state (representatives).

C Montemagno said that he could not respond because he was prohibited from doing so.

K Jones commented that much of the resolution relied on enrollment numbers. She asked where SIUC was in the process of hiring an enrollment manager.

C Montemagno said that the job was posted. The original pool was not as strong as the University would have liked. He anticipated that 3 candidates would visit campus in April, and he hoped that a candidate would be in place by July 1.

R Whaley mentioned that SIUE was counting PhD students in joint programs for enrollment figures.

C Montemagno said that that was correct and that they were counting students in terminal degrees.

W Calvert asked why at the December graduation the Graduate Council and GPSC were not represented on the platform.

C Montemagno answered that it was an unintentional oversight.

L Chevalier said that she had brought the issue up with Vanessa Sneed.

J Maddox asked about the rumors of a satellite Law School in Springfield.

C Montemagno responded that a satellite Law School had been discussed for Springfield or Edwardsville but that discussions were very much in the exploration phase. He said that he was in contact with Dean Behan and that both agreed that the Law faculty should be engaged in the process going forward.

J Maddox asked about the rumor of its being a night school.

C Montemagno said that all kinds of possibilities were informally discussed.

T Haniotakis suggested that we could not just compare the number of enrollment when determining money allocation. The allocation depends on the quality of education, buildings, and faculty.

C Montemagno said that he referred to that point in his letter to the President.

T Clark noted that he thought the credibility of the witness was in question regarding the resolution. He added that if the numbers are plainly wrong in places then that should be demonstrated and annotated so that even a skeptic will see the data is incorrect.

C Montemagno recused himself from that discussion.

W Calvert asked if there were any actions for the Graduate Council body that could be taken to fight off the resolution.

C Montemagno recused himself again, stating that he was simply there to provide information.

J Lynn Smith said that the Chancellor had mentioned the proposed School of Arts. She then asked why he hadn't mentioned the proposal for a College of Social Sciences and Humanities. She said that the RME was read before the Board and sent to D DiLalla, L Chevalier, and the Faculty Senate two weeks earlier.

C Montemagno said that the RME had not yet reached his office.

L Schaefer suggested that SIUC consider a rhetorical strategy in responding to resolution GG that mentions its past mistakes and how it plans to fix those mistakes.

C Montemagno said that included in his response was a document describing the achievements of his first six months, which include improvements to core curriculum, retention, alumni outreach, and student advisement. He added that the Institution is on its way up, that the last open house welcomed 3 times the potential students that it had since 2016, that 200 attended the Aviation open house the previous week, and that 500 to 700 were expected to attend the Agriculture open house. Students, he said, are excited about improvements to the community and campus, which include a potential makerspace.

J Garvey said he had visited Stanford recently to discuss those makerspace ideas for SIUC. He saw there similarities to SIUC, including similar facilities, similar equipment, similar faculty, and similar quality students.

D McDowell reiterated that Law students had heard about a possible satellite Law school. He then asked that the Chancellor consider renovating the current Law school at SIUC.

L Schaefer noted that the institution had little dedication to Title IX issues and that it could be a reason that female enrollment at SIUC was 10% behind the national average. She asked if the administration was doing anything to hire a full-time Title IX Officer and/ or increase the Title IX budget. She added that the university spends significantly more on workplace answers and less on consent and respect training.

C Montemagno said that the administration was dealing with that issue in a coordinated and complete manner, which included efforts at diversity and the recruitment of staff to deal with diversity demands. The diversity council had provided him with a plan that included everything from courses to having a Title IX policy for every college and school. He said he wants a coherent solution that incorporates diversity into the SIUC culture.

L Schaefer expressed concern about funding for said initiative. SIUC is currently only spending \$2000 on its consent training, she said. Money is part of changing the culture, and providing an immersive

education, requires a fully staffed Title IX office that forwards the effort. She added that she was not convinced that that money was in the diversity and inclusion plan, though the plan is a good start.

S Lahiri asked if the supposed excitement of prospective students would be reflected in the enrollment numbers for the fall.

C Montemagno said that SIUC was recruiting right then for 2019. Projections for fall 2018 were made and have been the same since November. He reiterated that recruitment occurred last year for fall of 2018. He hoped for stabilization and an increased enrollment for the future.

C Awsumb asked if the document of achievements over the previous six months that the Chancellor mentioned above would be presented at the BOT meeting.

C Montemagno said that it would be touched on.

J Lynn Smith mentioned a 10 page document that she had put together and sent to J Garvey about achievements in the arts and humanities. She asked if this would be addressed.

C Montemagno said that it would.

- **Remarks—Co-provost's David DiLalla and Lizette Chevalier**

D DiLalla said that his office was pleased that Meera Komarraju would be coming on board as interim Provost, pending approval of the BOT the following week. His office has been engaged with M Komarraju concerning transition. He added that the office of Provost was in the process of appointing an interim Dean in COLA as well. He said that his office hoped to have that interim dean in place immediately following M Komarraju's transition. The Provost office was also searching for a permanent associate dean for the Graduate School and would be making an announcement as soon as someone was found. Changing subjects, he mentioned that his office helps the provost with budgets. It would be irresponsible, he thought, for departments not to be planning contingencies for whatever the BOT decided to do the following week. He explained that if we take a \$5.1 million reduction 3 months before the fiscal year, we would possibly have to eliminate 120 NTT positions, for example. His office has communicated to deans that they should be conservative in budget planning and consider contingency planning for courses. In this regard, he added, his office was being as proactive as possible.

C Montemagno said that his office had managed for a reduction of budget for FY19. He also said that he had planned on \$1 million of that budget going to a 1% raise for faculty. He said that should resolution GG-1 be passed, all of that planning would be useless.

S Lahiri asked whether the faculty should expect a 1% raise if the BOT did not pass resolution GG-1.

C Montemagno said that he had submitted to the BOT a 1% raise for faculty and was asked to pull it. Resolution GG-1 he thought was probably why.

A Fakhoury asked whether the resolution would need to be approved by the IBHE.

C Montemagno answered no that money comes to the system and how that money is distributed is determined by the system itself.

J Lynn Smith noted that not only was the freshmen class enrollment anticipated to be low but that the graduating senior class had the largest enrollment on campus.

C Montemagno said his planning took that into account.

J Lynn Smith noted that COLA chairs and directors were planning for cuts.

C Montemagno said that his goal was to provide stability for the institution moving forward. He added that he couldn't promise that an emergency on campus would not require a change in plans. He emphasized, however, that a 5-10% budget cut, despite what the press reported, was not requested.

L Chevalier reported that she understood the desire of departments to maintain autonomy when merging into new proposed schools. She said that it was important that mergers were between two equal partners. She added that proposed new schools would temporarily be reporting to the provost while operating papers were being written. She also recently met with the HLC liaison and was working with the HLC committee on faculty qualification questions. A memo from the provost's office was issued concerning how to go about the faculty of record issue. She then emphasized the need to move to a "faculty of record" terminology. She said that she would encourage the incoming provost to continue to forward a committee on graduate teaching as well.

L Schaefer asked what was found wrong with the appointment of graduate students as "instructors of record".

L Chevalier said that there was not a problem with appointment, which happens in the departments, but with teacher qualifications and degree completion before entering the classroom. There needs to be a "faculty of record" for courses.

L Schaefer pointed to an issue she had with the memo and the lack therein of a direction for determining graduate student criteria and exceptions to the policy.

L Chevalier said she would like to direct that to the committee that is being proposed.

D DiLalla said that we need to make sure that we have qualified people in the classrooms, whether that is faculty, NTT, or otherwise. He said that his office would do this using HLC qualifications specified in the job advertisement and by making sure that anyone in the classroom has the appropriate degree and qualifications.

L Chevalier referenced the memo which reflect the state's audits push for a policy and procedures manual on everything from appointments to scholarships. Best practice would require clear guidelines on how these processes should be completed.

R Whaley asked to clarify that M.A. students did need to have a faculty mentor. She thought that that was not the case and was taken care of for the Sociology department.

D DiLalla clarified that he meant master's students not currently holding the master's degree.

K Jones referenced the value of the self-studies posted on the APAP website. She then asked D DiLalla if he had advice for workload assignment going forward.

D DiLalla said that there would be more clarity after the BOT meeting. He encouraged departments to make assignments based on what was going on at that point in time.

S Lahiri asked if there were any plans to appoint a permanent provost or vice-chancellor of research.

C Montemagno said he was engaged in a search which should conclude the next academic year.

C Awsumb suggested that some clarity was needed in the memo regarding graduate students as instructor of record for disciplinary indeterminate courses, courses that do not fall into specific categories or are cross-referenced. He wondered how these appointments would be handled for graduate students teaching outside of their areas of specialization.

L Chevalier said that they have been asking chairs to assign as they deem appropriate.

D DiLalla said that the process would be similar to how it was handled then by putting discipline or allied discipline requirements in job descriptions. Search committees and chairs will make a determination on qualifications of individuals.

C Awsumb suggested that that chair/director language be added to the memo for clarity.

D DiLalla said that he was not looking to unnecessarily restrict what anyone does or to change past practices.

L Chevalier added that the HLC committee was struggling with that issue and had no definitive answer. She encouraged C Awsumb to get some of these questions to the committee.

M Brown said that at that point it was most important to document the process of how we get to our decisions regarding HLC policy. Explaining the process helps to protect graduate students.

L Schaefer was concerned that the new structure would require more work for faculty as advisors. She then asked whether new assignments would be counted as service or compensated in any way.

D DiLalla answered that directors and coordinators would work together to make those calls. He said he would direct chairs and deans to make appropriate service changes to correspond with other changes and to be consistent with the contract.

J Lynn Smith mentioned that online the primary instructor and student could be listed together. There is some question as to whether the graduate student listed could input grades.

L Chevalier said they were working on the second part.

D DiLalla said that this was a good example of how the process was already working. It has been a long standing practice of listing instructor and student together.

- **Remarks—Interim Vice-Chancellor, Jim Garvey**

J Garvey noted that the electron microscope that was temporarily down was back up and functioning thanks to the efforts of the image facility and physical plant who got the necessary part for fixing it. He added that congress had passed a federal budget and that there were increases across the board for NIH NSF funding. He encouraged faculty to continue to go after those federal grants. He then opened the floor for questions.

- **Remarks—Interim Associate Dean & and Director, Juliane Wallace**

J Wallace said that the graduate council elections were concluded and that memos have been sent out to incoming members. She said the council will recognize outgoing members in May's meeting. She then

described application and enrollment numbers. Master's applications for fall are down 24 or 1.9% and admissions is down 11 or 3.8%. Doctoral applications are down 16 or 3% and admissions is down 8 or 9%. She encourage departments to follow-up on incomplete applications. She added that colleges should be making DRA awards decisions and that official decisions should be mailed as of April 20th. She concluded that the Graduate School was preparing for spring graduation.

D McDowell asked if J Wallace had numbers on professional student applications and admissions, including the medical school and the law school.

J Wallace said she did not have access to that information right then.

S Rimmer noted that the graduate student numbers were influenced by GA lines. She then asked if additional lines would be released.

C Montemagno answered that those were pending until the BOT meeting.

D DiLalla said that the direction from October was still in force. Deans were directed to make strategic investments up to 75% of last year's budget.

S Rimmer said that different colleges handled things differently and that the School of Science, for example, was at 57% of GAs that it had just 3 years earlier. She added that with a 75% reduction and then another 73% reduction they had reached that 57% number.

D DiLalla said that he did not dispute this figure, but he wanted to be clear that a year ago the institution did not cut budgets to 75% but said that departments could allocate 75% of that current budget. This was not a cut, though some colleges did make permanent reductions to their GA budgets.

S Rimmer responded that the School of Science was looking at a much reduced number of GAs.

T Haniotakis asked if there were records for the number of doctoral students that pay tuition. He then asked to discuss the number of GA positions offered.

C Montemagno said that the number offered did not make a difference in budget, but it did make a difference in our ranking nationally and in terms of productivity of our faculty by providing bandwidth enough to seek grants.

T Haniotakis then asked if we could be more creative with our use of tuition waivers.

J Garvey said that that would take an act of the Graduate Council. GAU would have to be involved as well.

C Montemagno answered that the state requires SIUC to only give out a certain number of tuition waivers. We could offer a tuition scholarship and not a tuition fellowship, which could be rewarding.

D DiLalla noted that we have work to do if colleges have made serious reduction to GA numbers as there is a correlation between GA line offerings and graduate enrollment.

C Montemagno said that even if tuition waivers were given without assistantships, we still need to have the financial bandwidth for students to do productive work. He added that the Council should figure this out in order to do justice to students.

J Wallace noted the number of GA contracts that were coming through the Graduate School in January, February, and March because colleges held onto 25% of their budgets. This means that departments are looking for individuals that need contracts and not using them for recruiting purposes, which is not what the GA is for. We need to be using the 25% for recruiting, she said.

W Calvert said that Mathematics withheld contracts until courses were determined so that they had funding to bring people in. He added that he could not recruit in August, but could through May.

N Carver mentioned Computer Sciences makes decisions at the beginning of semesters after looking at enrollment and determining how many students with GAs they need. He said that this process reduced complaints from undergraduates to almost zero over the last few years.

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

No remarks

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

T Velasco reported that efforts to have a speed-networking event have failed. SIUE and SIUC were going to try one more time to hold an event, and he said he was going to encourage the next Graduate Council chair to continue those efforts. He then directed the body to resolution GG-1. He argued that a response was necessary from the Council. He said that the executive committee would get together immediately to write a letter to submit to the BOT. Faculty Senate has written a letter on the topic, and a copy of the letter was provided to the Council, which he wanted to write something similar. He expressed that the passing of resolution GG-1 would have enormous repercussions on the University.

T Haniotakis suggested that the Council needed to stress the lack of time offered to comment on the decision. He proposed moving the discussion to the following meeting.

T Velasco noted that the Council could not wait until the following meeting as the BOT would vote the following week.

R Whaley asked what the BOT procedure for voting was.

T Velasco answered that he did not know.

A Fakhoury understood that the BOT would be voting on this resolution the following week. Faculty Senate's executive committee came up with a letter to submit to the BOT. He said there would be a resolution expressing opposition to the resolution and that Faculty Senate would ask for speaking time at the next BOT meeting.

T McCubbin said the Council should consider whether it can do a resolution immediately.

T Velasco noted the bad timing and felt that the only thing to do would be to execute a letter and a memo directed to the BOT.

Multiple members discussed adopting a resolution that day.

W Calvert moved that this council express its opposition to resolution GG-1:

[Graduate Council Motion in Response to Resolution GG1 Passed on 05 April 2018.docx](#)

S Donahoo seconded.

T McCubbin suggested a friendly amendment to recognize the “lack of timely notice”.

T Haniotakis asked about the current loan pay-back status for SIUC to SIUE.

K Jones said that SIUC had already payed back the loan to SIUE.

L Schaefer noted that the Council’s operating papers allowed for an emergency meeting with at least 48 hours’ notice, if the body would be interested in drafting and voting on a resolution.

T Velasco asked about the procedure for scheduling an emergency meeting.

S Rimmer suggested voting on the motion regardless in the event that a quorum was not reached at the emergency meeting.

T Clark recognized that time was urgent and asked whether the document could be gotten to the *DE* and/or *The Southern* so that the Council’s opinions would not be lost in the noise. He also suggested that the Council wordsmith the Faculty Senate document to serve its own purposes.

T Velasco proposed a vote on the motion from W Calvert and an emergency meeting Monday morning.

T Haniotakis added that if one could not make it, he/she could send a proxy.

J Flowers said that T Velasco could call an emergency meeting without a vote. He added, however, that the BOT did not need to consult the Chancellor to pass this resolution as it falls under the jurisdiction of the financial committee. We can protest, but the President can ignore this and the BOT could approve it.

T Velasco said that he thought the Council should do something. He then took a count of who could make it to an emergency meeting at 8AM, Monday, 9 April, 2018.

E Stephenson read the motion as proposed.

J Lynn Smith cautioned that Edwardsville was sensitive to arguments against them.

T McCubbin suggested the addition of “strong” opposition to the motion.

R Whaley asked about the accuracy of the “proposed by” language in the motion.

W Calvert suggested the above language be replaced with “on the board of Trustee April 12th meeting”.

S Donahoo motioned for a suspension of Roberts Rules to move to a vote on the previous motion.

K Jones seconded.

The Graduate Council voted to suspend Robert’s Rules: 22 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained.

J Partridge motioned to vote on the motion to oppose resolution GG-1.

K Jones seconded.

The Graduate Council voted on the motion to oppose resolution GG-1: 22 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained. The motion was adopted unanimously.

K Jones motioned to reinstate Robert’s Rules.

J Partridge seconded.

The Graduate Council voted to reinstate Roberts Rules: 22 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained.

W Calvert additionally moved that the Chair communicate the content of the previous motion to the President, the BOT, and other parties as he and the Executive Council deemed fit.

M Brown seconded.

T McCubbin suggested an amendment including the word “immediate”.

T Velasco said that he would communicate that information and that he would bring a resolution to the emergency meeting scheduled for 8 am the following Monday morning.

T McCubbin proposed specific language drawing attention to the inaccuracy of the data in GG-1 be included in the Council’s resolution.

S Lahiri asked whether this resolution would be communicated to the BOT.

J Partridge asked to clarify that the Council would be creating a resolution and a letter.

T Haniotakis asked whether the letter should go to the press.

T Velasco said that he thought all were good ideas.

T McCubbin then asked how to get Council representatives onto the agenda for the board meeting.

A Fakhoury added that it would be a good idea to coordinate timing and messaging with the Senate.

L Schaefer said that a good strategy would be to coordinate messages and to look up speaking timelines. She noted that people supportive of the BOT generally go at the end of the meetings, so that members should stagger when they sign up to speak.

Members discussed strategies for approaching the BOT and the structure of the BOT meeting.

T Velasco restated that the meeting would be held Monday morning to vote on a resolution.

J Lynn Smith said that speaking time before the BOT was generally limited to 2 minutes.

S Donahoo noted that they usually give more time to speakers during the Wednesday meeting.

C Awsumb asked if the body would nominate representatives or seek volunteers.

T Clark suggested that they should anticipate a strong pro-SUE constituency at both meetings.

T Velasco proposed moving the agenda forward.

Action Items:

Second Reading: Resolution in Support of the Elimination of a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Histotechnology.

The members voted on the resolution: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained. The resolution passed.

Second Reading: Resolution Requiring a Letter of Concurrence in the Creation of New Graduate Specialization.

The members voted on the resolution: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained. The resolution passed.

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

T Clark commented that this resolution might be a strange gift as it has fostered unity among the deans and among faculty. He said that from his department’s perspective, they have found the Chancellor to be amenable in discussions about reorganization. For example, the School of Business convinced him that neither Healthcare Management nor Ag. Economics should be merged into Business. ISIT and MPA programs conversely reached out to Business. The Chancellor was adamant about ISIT not coming into Business. HTM and Sports Administration programs are a good match for Business. The Business school had a unanimous vote on a proposal the previous week.

J Flowers said that updated program change proposal letters were not reflected in presented RMEs.

T Clark said that he thought the Chancellor kept those updates posted to his website.

J Flowers asked about C Montemagno’s apparent disregard for other deans’ opinions.

T Clark said he was giving one interaction in which the Chancellor had shown himself to be reasonable.

J Flowers asked for the deans’ perspectives on the appointment of new deans following reorganization.

T Clark said that there was some uncertainty. He said deans would like to see interim and new formed dean positions filled sooner rather than later. He thought that the Chancellor’s bandwidth of attention had been toward reorganization but that he was beginning to turn his attention to other things like moving paperwork. He was impressed with changes in the climate and horizons of the University and the School of Business specifically.

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

No Report

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

J Partridge reported that having received feedback on the Council’s resolution on proposed changes to grievance procedures, she would move to table the resolution until the May meeting.

The members voted to table the resolution: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained.

- **New Programs Committee, Wesley Calvert**

J Shapiro reported that the committee had begun to review program change proposals and RMEs. The committee received three proposals for a School of Computing, a School of Biological Sciences and a School of Earth Systems and Sustainability. Those RMEs have gone through many revisions since March 9th. One of the major revisions is the stipulation that each new school be assigned to the Provost’s office. He said that the NPC wants to bring resolutions to the council that have official faculty votes. A vote had taken place among the faculty of the proposed School of Computing, and the deadline for a vote on the proposed School of Biological Sciences was the following day. A question the committee continued to

have was about the inclusion of language in all new school RMEs that stipulate the proposed school report to the provost temporarily. They would like to be certain what “temporarily” means and what this stipulation would mean for future workload assignments, dean appointments, and tenure decisions. The committee felt it important that the Council’s voice weigh in on the process.

J Flowers said that his understanding was that housing new schools under the provost would help to avoid contract issues and allow school director and coordinator roles to function as intended.

R Whaley asked if the committee would seek feedback from constituency groups.

J Shapiro answered yes.

First Reading: Resolution in Support of a Doctor of Education.

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

No Report

- **Research Committee, Sajal Lahiri**

No Report

- **Program Review Committee, Sue Rimmer**

No Report

- **Report from GPSC, Clay Awsumb**

C Awsumb said that the GPSC survey results would be published soon. He then referred the members to the agenda for a list of resolutions passed by the GPSC body that year.

J Partridge said that HLC had distributed a campus climate survey. Her committee found out that not everyone got the survey; it would be sent out again.

Adjournment: The Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 10:14AM