

2017 Graduate Council

Meeting Minutes

December 7, 2017

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

Members Absent: William Babcock, Marc Morris, and Greg Rose.

Proxies: Johnathan Flowers for Sheena Hart, Katherine Hinders for Derrick McDowell, and Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies.

Ex-Officio: Lizette Chevalier, Terry Clark, David DiLalla, Ahmad Fakhoury, Yueh-Ting Lee, and Carlo Montemagno.

Guests: Susan Babbitt and Donna Bennett.

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:04 AM.

Consideration of Minutes

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes for the meeting held November 2, 2017—24 in favor. The minutes passed.

Remarks—Chancellor Carlo Montemagno

Chancellor Montemagno said that the process for reorganization was going forward and that he will be setting up meetings with all of the proposed schools and individual meetings with all of the faculty of the proposed schools. He said his first meeting was either that week or the following Monday with Transportation. He indicated that there has been movement between some of the colleges and that some of the programs that are going into the schools are making changes as a result of the meetings. He and the faculty will be refining the reorganization structure and engaging in dialogue to put together the best structure we can moving forward. He said he is looking forward to working with all of the present members (and others) in the process to reposition SIU as a world-class, comprehensive research university.

C Awsumb asked how the Chancellor saw graduate and professional students contributing to the University's reorganization of graduate programs in relation to continued graduate excellence.

C Montemagno responded that graduate and professional students will contribute by being the best students they can be. He will continue to work hard to support graduate advisors and their pursuit of funding graduate students. SIUC wants to provide the best educational experience possible. He said that if GPSC sees opportunities for the University to provide better support for graduate and professional students to please let him know. He said he would be more than happy to incorporate that as SIUC advances its reorganization.

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

Co-provost Chevalier indicated that in terms of reorganization the Provost's office received much outreach asking if the Co-provosts would meet with the proposed schools as well as with existing departments and schools. She said that the Chancellor will be meeting with the faculty of those proposed schools and with the faculty of existing departments and schools that are contacting them for dialogue and guidance. J Garvey, D DiLalla, and L Chevalier will team up to meet with individuals to answer questions where they can answer them and return with answers that had to be sought out. She believed that the deans had sent this information out, a fact which she wished to reinforce.

Co-provost D DiLalla added that their office met with Faculty Senate's executive committee the day before. They spoke of a series of complex meetings to occur shortly, agreeing it would be helpful if there was some sort of transparent, publically accessible means of tracking where things are in relation to proposals. He said that there is a similar kind of document in place that individuals may have heard of or seen in the past for RMEs or other program change proposals. These were up on the website in Dr. Chevalier's office. Their office recognizes that it is important to know where things are and where they are going. He indicated sabbatical applications were in some time back and that their office is working to have notifications of provost level decisions sent out shortly after the first of the year. Letters go out with a provost level determination and a reminder that they have to be approved by the Board of Trustees. He anticipates that these will be discussed at April's meeting. Deans have transmitted promotion and tenure cases to the Provost's office as well, and they are being worked on. Promotion and tenure recommendations, he believed, would go on the April Board of Trustees agenda also.

S Lahiri clarified that the immediate issue was enrollment. He then asked if anything was being done about enrollment irrespective of the reorganization.

C Montemagno said that we are dramatically changing the marketing materials we use and are engaged in a target marketing campaign. He spent a significant amount of resources to reach 1.4 million perspective students instead of 600,000, doubling the pool of individuals we approach. Unfortunately, a vast majority of students decided last spring which institution they were going to attend. This, he said, is why he needs to get the school structure in place. Then he can have the marketing materials from the schools and programs that reflect the excitement of what we are doing here out by early spring for 2019. He clarified that the whole recruiting cycle is an 18 month process, beginning in a student's junior year. He hopes that he can keep enrollment at current levels but that right now the data shows a 500 student drop.

D DiLalla added that there is an ongoing calling campaign taking place now. Faculty, Chairs, and Deans are reaching out directly to students. Those that study enrollment say that that kind of personal outreach from faculty is powerful in terms of helping students connect with the University. This process began 3 weeks ago.

C Montemagno said that the results were quite significant. Typically the number of applicants that come from inquiries is 3%, he said. When we reach out to the students, the number of applications from inquiry goes up to about 10%. It makes a real difference in expanding the pool of applicants. He expressed that if anyone is asked by a department chair or dean to participate in this, they should know it has a positive impact on applications we receive.

D DiLalla then mentioned the Graduate Enrollment Working Group. He said there has been some discussion about revitalizing that group by meeting more regularly to talk about the graduate admission side as well. He thinks this is a good idea.

S Lahiri asked if we had any sort of idea what went wrong in the past.

C Montemagno said that there has not been comprehensive marketing surveys but that the impression we are getting from outreach and limited queries is that students see no value-cost differential in coming to SIUC to pay more money.

S Lahiri asked to further discuss what was meant by “paying more money”.

C Montemagno clarified that paying more money is not the driving factor for low enrollment. Students do not see the difference in value for the cost of coming to SIUC as opposed to elsewhere.

S Lahiri added that value is relative. He said that we have seen a huge increase in tuition and fees and asked if we were going to look at that issue.

C Montemagno said that we have looked at it and that cost is not going down. He said that the problem is that SIUC has fixed-cost infrastructure designed for 22,000 students, and we are servicing 15,000 students. The cost of operation doesn't change so what has to happen is we need to increase enrollment or downsize the operation. He has chosen to try to increase enrollment and expand the value SIUC provides. He added that value is more than going to class or course offerings, but is the experience students get while they are here. He said he has made great efforts to improve student experience while they are here. For example a committee is in place to bring a concert series to SIUC next year. He wants to bring back big events to campus. Too, he has been working hard with the Dawg Pound. It is important for the students to feel their experience is more than driving to campus, attending class, and going home. His office has put in the financial aid package for the coming year resources to subsidize students to stay on campus. The rationale is threefold. 1) He wants to be able to give more financial aid for students to utilize the student halls. These halls are fixed cost, so we are paying for them anyway, which makes the cost marginal for adding a student. This financial incentive will reduce the burden on the student. 2) He wants to increase the full time presence of students on campus. This should be a 24/7 campus, he said. There should be activity and things going on all the time. Unfortunately, he noticed that at five in the afternoon it is like it is a commuter school and on the weekends no one is here. He needs students back on campus to create a vibrant student life. 3) He wishes to increase occupancy also. He can use this for leverage for funding to tear down the old towers and rebuild and remodel the new buildings. There can be no public and private investment if there is no occupancy, no demand. He also wants to streamline the experience that students are getting when they deal with the University's bureaucracy. Dr. Chevalier is doing some of that work with the advising changes. Part of the reorganization is creating exciting programming and coalescing resources; part is changing the experience students have when they get here. A lot of transition dialogue is over how to make the university more attractive to prospective students.

D DiLalla thought this circled back to reputation. He considers what students, parents, communities and other outside constituencies think of SIUC. Despite the good things we do inside, he said, sometimes the word outside is different. He argued we should develop our reputation and try to make ourselves, as the chancellor said, a destination university by aligning the view outside with what it is inside.

R Whaley commented that a colleague of hers had heard that, in the last two years during the budget crisis, the University of Illinois had lowered its admissions standards. She asked whether the IBHE allowed them to do that.

C Montemagno responded that the IBHE does not control admissions standards; these are controlled by the institutions. IBHE controls programing. The UofI, he said, did lower its standards and leveraged their reputation to attract students to go there. This comes down to a value-cost proposition as well.

D DiLalla said that this was a dangerous game. Word has spread across the nation that the Uofl has lowered its admission standards.

C Montemagno added that SIUC lowered its standards in 2013 and 2014, causing incredible brand damage. He said he hears how SIUC went from being a selective institution to being an open institution.

R Whaley clarified that she did not think SIUC should lower its standards. She was concerned that the Uofl may be taking some of SIUC's students.

C Montemagno said that SIUC must distinguish its offerings and experience from other universities. Uofl is a big place and their educational system is impersonal. He then said he wants SIUC to have the advantage of being personal, where faculty know students and student know their faculty, where we can provide educational experience and content that is consistent with what they would receive elsewhere. We need to get that word out and engage in brand repair. He added that the damage we did in 2013-14 is going to take some time to repair.

S Rimmer followed up asking if the Chancellor could tell the Council about some of the changes in marketing he was talking about, whether SIUC was moving from regional to national and what that involved. She said she hadn't seen anything on television for example.

C Montemagno answered that SIUC does have a commercial on television but that commercials are mainly for parents.

S Rimmer said parents were important.

C Montemagno agreed, adding that the marketing we are doing is moving from regional to national. He said that he bought 1.46 million names, extending the pool of potential students to all states except Alaska and Hawaii. In the past, too, the market programing was shotgun. A student says they are interested in marketing so we dump information on them about the whole university. We have changed the marketing to be more targeted. We target individually based on personal qualifications. We are working in the sweet spot from the 10th percentile to the 20-30th percentile. This marketing plan, he said, is a stop gap; however, efforts are in progress to produce new materials for marketing schools and programs. Students will get materials from schools and see that they can be part of a community.

S Rimmer asked if marketing was being handled internally or externally through consultants.

C Montemagno responded, internally.

J Flowers added that the entire discussion concerning recruitment had focused on undergraduate students. He then asked what specifically the Office of the Provost was doing other than the reactivation of the Graduate Enrollment and Recruitment Taskforce to increase recruitment and enrollment at the graduate level.

D DiLalla said he would like to reenergize the above mentioned group to decide such matters as whether graduate programs should be department focused or focused in the Graduate School. He said he did not have a lot of information at this point, other than reenergizing this committee next year.

J Flowers asked if he could say why this initiative was coming out of the Provost's office and not the Graduate School as it has in the past.

D DiLalla said he could not say at that time.

T Haniotakis asked if SIUC was going after students that will pay tuition for graduate studies, or if it was only going after the ones who get scholarships.

D DiLalla responded that the answer was both.

T Haniotakis clarified that for the ones who seek scholarships, we have some scholarships for them.

D DiLalla said that it was always a benefit if there were students willing to pay tuition for programs but that can't be where we hang our hat. We have to be successful in both areas. He then responded to J Flowers's previous question, saying that the Provost's Office had always directed the Graduate School on admissions and strategies for recruitment. He added that an enrollment management position was going to be filled but that the Provost's office had always overseen this process.

W Calvert asked that although it was very early in the legislative process, had there been some contingency planning should graduate tuition waivers become taxable.

D DiLalla said he did not know what happens. He added that John Charles, the University's lobbyist, was working on the issue; it would be disturbing if the house version prevailed. If that occurred, he said, we would have to think of alternative strategies to assist the financial burden.

C Montemagno stated that the problem was worse than that. The problem is that tuition benefits for the SIUC faculty's children will also become taxable. He said that we have a large number of staff here who work at reduced wages because they saw this as a savings plan to send their kids to university. They decided I'll make less money but at least I know my child can attend SIUC. The students will still attend but staff and faculty will have to pay 20-30% of that cost out of pocket in taxes. It is a real challenge for all of higher education.

T McCubbin asked to clarify that they were saying the SIUC lobbyist was working with Mike Bost and other members of congress.

D DiLalla responded that that was his understanding. John Charles has been actively engaged in this, as are other university organizations.

J Flowers invoked Robert's Rules asking whether the Co-Provosts would yield to a series of questions.

D DiLalla answered yes.

J Flowers asked in what ways making SIUC a 24 hour campus would improve systemic issues faced by not only graduate but undergraduate students where issues of diversity are concerned.

D DiLalla responded that it was difficult to answer, but he felt that a vibrant and engaged campus, where students are on the ground interacting with each other, interacting with faculty, touches on and affects all the things you are talking about.

J Flowers asked if there were any changes planned to the organizational structure of the graduate school going forward into the next semester.

D DiLalla said he was not going to comment on that at that time.

J Flowers then asked with regards to program reviews, if there were any programs up for review at the graduate level.

L Chevalier replied that all programs were up for review on an 8 year cycle by the IBHE. Those up for review are posted to the APAP website

C Awsumb added that in relation to putting our priority on student experience, we do have student organizations in place (GPSC, for example) that do fund things that are put on by student organizations as part of the academic experience. He said GPSC has had little engagement with the administration that focused on the priority of revitalizing our campus as a whole. He commented that there are areas of opportunity where the graduate community can contribute to the revitalization of campus life.

L Chevalier said she agreed and that a lot of the student programming is going through Vice-Chancellor Stettler's office. She would be happy to hear from GPSC.

D DiLalla clarified that his office meets with GPSC regularly, suggesting something on academics could be added to the agenda.

C Montemagno said that he sees an increase in intercollegiate competitions involvement, where teams are coached by faculty and graduate students. These events increase the visibility of the University and create cohesion of students, bringing together students of different backgrounds to work towards a shared goal; it improves the esprit de corps of the whole enterprise. If graduate students could identify activities they would like to engage in, he would like to help provide resources and put those teams together.

J Maddox indicated that in the past the Law School had had 24 hour access to the library, and that that had stopped last year. She thinks it makes sense when we want to increase our Bar pass rate that we reopen library hours. She wondered that if money was going into extracurricular activities could it also open the library.

C Montemagno said he was unaware that this had occurred and indicated he would look into it. The library, he added, should be open 24/7.

K Hinders said when she toured in the spring, the library was closed on the weekend. She added it is still frustrating as a student that wants to get work done on a Saturday at the library. She understands budget issues but wondered if there was a plan for extending hours going forward.

D DiLalla said there is not yet a plan, but there is recognition of a problem. We were in a position where we had to make some pretty excruciating decisions about what to do and not do during the budget cuts. We did get the library back open for the exams. That is a good thing but doesn't fix the problem. He said he appreciated hearing it brought up again.

L Schaefer asked for comments about the lack of upper level administration in the Graduate School and how it might affect enrollment, public perception, research and SIUC's ability to recruit graduate students.

L Chevalier and D DiLalla asked if L Schaefer could clarify the question.

L Schaefer replied that it seems like there were several vacant positions at Graduate School.

W Calvert clarified that L Schaefer was talking about the absence of an Assistant Dean.

D DiLalla said he would not comment on that.

L Schaefer asked if anyone could comment on how that vacancy would affect the Graduate School in the spring without the administration we are used to having.

D DiLalla said he would not comment today.

S Lahiri said that he regularly is on campus on the weekends and cannot find coffee places open.

C Montemagno answered that this problem is one of the reasons he wants a 24/7 campus. He was dismayed when he first visited on a Saturday afternoon and everything was closed at the Student Union.

D DiLalla added that they were working on a plan with the Dean of the library to see what it would take to open the library 7 days a week. He had some ideas.

S Rimmer commented that in her building, on the weekends, many times the lights are out in the hallway.

D DiLalla said he would have to find out more about that. He said that if there were safety concerns to let him know. We need to be aware if we are compromising safety for energy savings.

J Flowers asked if there were plans to direct additional funding to campus research centers. Given the persistent budget crisis, many of these research centers have lost funding or had their resources reduced. These centers were draws for graduate students. These are integral, he said, to the graduate education enterprise at the University. He asked again if there were any plans to more closely integrate these units on campus.

D DiLalla thought this was a critically important point, illustrating the difficulty of the position we have found ourselves in. He said that in the range of bad choices for facing the budget crisis, we had to consider whether to gut academic units and inflict that pain or make reductions in research units. They chose those auxiliary research units to take more cuts because they thought they were less damaging than some other things. The immediate challenge is that the money invested coming from overhead recovery does not give the University flexibility. One of the advantages of building the research mission is that external grant contract activity benefits us by increasing indirect cost. Overhead recovery money can be invested in programs under discussion. He added that the money would not be there that day, but that the administration was keen on increasing external grant support to help overhead recovery.

Remarks—Interim Vice-Chancellor for Research Jim Garvey

No Remarks

Remarks—Graduate School Dean Yueh-Ting Lee

Dean Yueh-Ting Lee pointed out that he and others had developed the Graduate School's Strategic Priorities based on the work of Graduate School Enrollment Task Forces in the past years. There are five strategic priorities. Strategic Priority Goal 1 is to increase enrollment; Strategic Priority Goal 2 is to maintain high quality—i.e., support graduate education excellence and student success; Strategic Priority Goal 3 is to promote diversity, equity and communication; Strategic Priority Goal 4 is to advocate and improve graduate education's best practices and efficiencies; and Strategic Priority Goal 5 is to maximize resources and reconnect and engage with graduate alums. He mentioned that the most recent version (updated in early October 2017) is available on the Graduate School's website. On November 8 Wednesday, the Graduate School organized a Q&A session in this building for graduate faculty, graduate students and staff members about how to apply for different assistantships and fellowships in 2018-2019, he said. He added that on November 15, the Graduate School organized a recruitment initiative and approximately ten different departments or program participated in this event in Morris Library. Some prospective undergraduate students stopped by and asked questions about how to apply for graduate programs. After the exhibit, there was a panel to answer student questions in regards to the process and details of applying to different graduate programs. He said that on November 29, the Graduate Council and the Graduate, Professional Student Council and the Graduate School organized a mentorship symposium. Graduate Council Chair Dr. Tomas Velasco and GPSC President

Johnathan Flower co-chaired this symposium. Faculty members, students and staff members came to this event, he indicated. The purpose of this symposium was to facilitate communication and interaction between mentors and mentees. Faculty mentor-award recipients from the spring of 2017 as well as graduate students presented at the symposium. He then thanked Graduate Student Lauren Schaefer and faculty members Dr. Ahmad Fakhoury, Dr. Jared Porter, Dr. Shannon McDonald, Dr. Jonathan Bean, and Dr. Phil Tsuchin Chu for their participation as symposium speakers. He concluded by mentioning that the fall issue of the Graduate Saluki Stories had just come out. He passed that around for members to view.

K Stickers asked whether anyone knew the effect that the announced restructuring plan would have on graduate student enrollment. He offered an example from his department to show student concern about the proposal, asking if others were experiencing this and if it were causing problems with recruitment and retention. He wondered if there was something else to tell the students to ease their minds.

Y Lee replied that change big or small always has an impact. He was sure that the reorganization would as well, constructive or otherwise. He added that if students had concerns that they could talk to him or the Provost's office.

D DiLalla clarified that any change from what has been a long standing way of doing things makes people nervous. He said we need to as forcefully and as clearly as we can assure students that nothing is changing about the degree program and that we are committed to serving them. We should assure them that the day-to-day business of the graduate student is not going to change, he said. We are looking at a shift in administrative structure. We should work as faculty and administrators to show that we are committed to the student if s/he chooses us by getting them to the degree in the same way we always have.

K Stickers said this is what he does say, but asked about those he can't have that conversations with because they go elsewhere.

D DiLalla responded that we need to be proactive and clear that we are talking about changes to the administrative structure not programs.

S Lahiri commented that successful completion was also getting a job. He said that students with a PhD who are coming from a division of economics and not a department may be viewed differently. Departments are the culture prevalent everywhere.

D DiLalla replied that there are departments right now that are conglomerates of older units and that there are school organizations similar to what SIUC is talking about.

S Lahiri said that the faculty is not rejecting some departments merging but just the initiative to have all departments merge. People are concerned that major disciplines will lose their identities, he said.

C Montemagno said that people have been telling him this but if you look at the University of Edinburgh, for example, with 3 colleges, 20 schools, and subunits, it works. They are ranked 19th in the world and do not have departments.

C Awsumb commented that this didn't just change administrative structure, if operating papers would have to be redrawn for the management of curriculum and departments hiring decisions/practices. He clarified that we were not just talking about administrative restructuring but redefining the entire management, delivery, and trajectory of all programs, which opens the door to changes for other things.

D DiLalla responded that it would be a challenge for the faculty when they create those new operating papers. They will have to ensure individuals are qualified to be on decision making committees.

T Haniotakis said that the concern students have with restructuring is what will happen to assistantships. He added that there are rumors that when departments consolidate students from smaller programs will lose assistantships. He then asked Dean Lee about his having a student whose undergraduate advisor told him not to remain at SIUC for his graduate work. We need to look not just at teachers but at our undergraduate advisors, he said.

L Chevalier said that this concern was brought to her office. She wants to retool the advisors to be pro-SIU, to provide them with tools and marketing that makes them proud of where they work. She said if there continued to be this issue to let her know.

L Schaefer claimed that it was academically corrupt to tell students to go here in solidarity with the school when it is maybe not best for the students. She added that this is why graduate students have been asking for mentorship. We need people to give us honest answers about what graduate program is the best for us, she said.

T McCubbin said she understands concerns from departments as well as the excitement the administration has for this change. She asked for a one sentence statement that our faculty can tell people for the why this restructuring is being made. We are doing it for administrative changes is not good enough. She added it needs to be an affirmative statement to help us understand this better.

L Chevalier indicated she understood what T McCubbin was saying. The executive council asked for four.

C Montemagno responded that SIUC is not doing administrative changes for the sake of administrative changes. We are doing administrative change because we are looking at repositioning our university as a new American research university, he clarified, one that leads the way in organizational structuring. The organization of universities was largely cemented in 1880 to emulate the ivy leagues. Now people recognize that the real place of discovery is at the boundaries of disciplines. In the last 25 years, institutions have been struggling organizationally to work in a cross- and trans-disciplinary way within their bureaucratic structures. He said that SIUC is looking at either remaining a comprehensive 4 year research university or retreating to become a primarily undergraduate regional school. This is the decision being made.

T McCubbin reiterated that they need to boil that vision down to a one or two sentence statement that is simpler and persuasive

D DiLalla said that the advantage of this plan is that it preserves a vast majority of what we already do. To fail would be more damaging for some departments.

S Lahiri responded that there must be many alternatives to this particular restructuring.

C Montemagno indicated that in the last 3 months, nobody had given him a viable alternative. He added that we cannot study alternatives for years, because we won't exist in 3 years. He said that he is going to have to go to the Board on Wednesday and give them my pre-budget for next year based on the enrollment data he has. There will be a \$4.6 million cut next year.

S Lahiri clarified that he was not for status quo.

C Montemagno said that speed is a requirement too.

S Lahiri claimed that we could have speed and still consider the many options. You can reorganize schools and colleges without doing away with departments, for example, he said. You can save on administrative costs. There are ways of doing this.

C Montemagno replied that this is not about saving money on department chairs.

S Lahiri said that this seemed to be about killing departments, asking why we couldn't bring people together without doing that.

L Schaefer appreciated that the administration was asking for alternatives, but she thought that part of the issues is that it is moving so fast that it is difficult for students and faculty to offer feedback and develop their own plans. She then asked whether the Chancellor could talk about what he means by viable alternatives, what his standard of viability was and what evidence he had that his plan was viable.

C Montemagno answered that a viable plan is based on other universities that have successfully done a similar reorganization. He said he as only received one comprehensive alternative plan, which proposed to eliminate all colleges and have 20 schools reporting to the Provost. He said managerially this wouldn't work. Other plans have to do with very small niches inside individual schools or with individual programs, but he is looking for a comprehensive plan, one that is managerially possible.

L Schaefer asked what he thought made his plan viable.

C Montemagno gave an example of Arizona State University that went from 60 departments to 40 schools and dramatically increased its enrollment and research portfolio, energized its faculty, and enhanced its community outreach.

L Schaefer commented that ASU had different issues than SIUC.

C Montemagno responded that ASU went from 50,000 students to 70,000. He reiterated that ASU was different, and that SIUC's changes would meet its own needs, values, and cultures. He said he was giving an example of how when departments were eliminated, the world did not come to an end.

L Schaefer suggested that some people would have significantly less fear about this plan if the Chancellor could offer an example from a university similar to SIUC.

D DiLalla answered that SIUC has already done a similar reorganization in the past, but one that was not global. Academic schools have been brought together from different degrees, making the proof of concept right here at SIU, he said.

J Lynn Smith commented that as a chair she is compensated \$20,000 extra per year. She asked where the savings was in adding directors. She added too that the Humanities faculty took a straw poll and were 43-0 against the plan.

C Montemagno replied that directors would not be compensated but would count their time as service. Three parts of the job are teaching, research, and service. Directors would get course relief and count their time as service.

J Lynn Smith clarified that then there was no saving.

C Montemagno answered that savings were incidental and that he was talking about revitalizing the University. He understands and appreciates that the Humanities faculty are reluctant to change. He added that it is not enough to say one doesn't want to do something, s/he has to offer an alternative.

J Lynn Smith said she was working on an alternative.

C Montemagno reiterated that if the faculty does not want to do the plan, they must provide an alternative. He said he is open to suggestions as evidenced by the changes he has already made to the plan.

C Awsumb said that it was not always clear what we are getting out of the reorganization. He asked how the restructuring effected the faculty's drawing up operating papers, for example. He said he never saw the reorganization as creating efficiency, creating new money, or reducing overhead but as a means of organizing resource flow across the university. Doing that, there are alternative structures. He then asked if determining curriculum, etc. still be done by the faculty in the discipline when departmental issues are brought to the broader school level, and whether people outside of a discipline will have a say in how other curriculum and course offerings are administered. This is the concern of the faculty.

D DiLalla responded that his office would not presume to tell academic units what to do with their operating papers. Constituency groups, he said, can provide guidance for best practice for operating provisions for faculty. There is a way to juggle perspectives on merged operating papers. The Faculty Senate appeared interested in this process. Operating paper provisions will continue to arise from faculty and constituency groups.

W Calvert added that currently departments have to decide what courses run each semester. He commented that he did not feel qualified to comment on what Chemistry courses should be taught and could only comment on what should run in his discipline. These things, he said, do respect disciplinary boundaries in a way that the proposal has not assured the new structure will.

D DiLalla said it already works currently with schools incorporating different disciplines. They rely on expertise from others to make curriculum and course offering decisions.

W Calvert replied that someone has to make the final call, though.

D DiLalla answered absolutely, but that this already happens in complex schools.

S Rimmer said we have both schools and departments here. She asked why schools and departments couldn't exist.

D DiLalla clarified that these were parallel structures currently.

S Rimmer asked why not have schools in some places and departments for disciplines that lend themselves to being in departments.

D DiLalla said we could do that and are doing it right now. However if we allow the argument that a department is so unique that it should remain a department, we would get 50 unique departments, he said. This is why we are going with a University-wide approach. It is difficult, he added, to decide who can remain a department and who will move to a school.

S Lahiri asked why not call it a school that will have departments under it.

D DiLalla thought that he understood the concern to be not what we call things but to be the potential loss of departmental autonomy.

S Rimmer gave the University of Kentucky as an example, where the Biological Sciences incorporated all departments. There were department chairs and directors.

D DiLalla said he thought that would increase administrative complexity.

S Rimmer they were equal director and department chairs. She asked if we could meld school models that work well and others that do not.

D DiLalla expressed it was tough to make calls discipline by discipline in this regard.

S Rimmer asked whether the incentive to merge then comes from the bottom up.

W Calvert called for a point of order, saying that technically the Council was having the associate provost for academic programs entertain questions on her report prior to her report. He wondered if this discussion may be more fruitful when considering the below resolution.

J Lynn Smith commented that administrators should let schools that want to do the reorganization do it. She added forcing departments into this won't work.

J Flowers asked Y Lee if he intended to reconvene the Graduate Advisory Board.

Y Lee said that according to the by-laws the function of the group was to fundraise. They were supportive of graduate education and active in giving money for travel. For example, each student that presented at a conference received \$50 as long as they got support elsewhere. They also raised enough money to support department sponsored colloquia as long as 10 graduate students signed up to attend. We sponsored 100 dollars. We could have done more, he said, but it is why we have GSS still. He hoped the board would continue.

D DiLalla said he agreed and that it was an excellent idea. He hoped it would continue.

L Chevalier said that from an assessment perspective receiving input from external constituency groups about development and fundraising was crucial. She said she even recommended it for Core Curriculum. She said it was critical to always be reaching out to external constituencies.

Remarks—Associate Provost for Academic Programs Lizette Chevalier

No Remarks

J Flowers asked for a brief update on the HLC reaccreditation process. He said he believed that the sub-committees were working on this. He then asked where the process was and what we could expect.

L Chevalier replied that the committees were continuing to write assurance arguments. HLC has also communicated on the financial status of the institution. Their response will be posted before the end of the year. Correspondence between HLC and SIUC will also be posted.

J Partridge added that the initial deadline for a first draft of the assurance arguments was Dec 1st, 2017. They decided that this was not the best time to distribute this draft so they took more time. She said the steering committee and others should be looking for this document early next semester.

L Chevalier asked if it were the same with M Brown's committee

M Brown responded, "Yes."

Report—Council's Chair, Tomás Velasco

No Report

Action Items:

Second Reading: Resolution in Support of the PhD Changes in GeologyThe Members voted on the resolution: Yes-22, No-0, and Abstain-0. The resolution passed.

Second Reading: Resolution in Support of Waiving the TOEFL Requirement for Applicants Holding a Master's Degree from an Accredited Institution in the United States.

The Members voted on the resolution: Yes 24, No-0, and Abstain-0. The resolution passed.

First Reading: Resolution Opposing the Elimination of All Academic Departments

C Awsumb understood that this resolution is similar to one the Graduate Faculty, GPSC, GAU and the Faculty Senate passed. He asked the council if they would be interested in moving to a vote on this resolution as all bodies have had a chance to express their views on it.

T Velasco asked if C Awsumb was making a motion to vote on the first reading.

W Calvert clarified that C Awsumb was asking if the action was irrelevant since other constituencies had passed similar resolutions. He said it could be misunderstood as an endorsement of the reorganization if the Graduate Council did not take an action like this.

T Velasco said that in order to vote on a first reading, Robert's Rules had to be suspended.

W Calvert moved to suspend Robert's Rules so as to take a vote on the action; he was seconded.

Vote to suspend Robert's Rules: Yes-20, No-4, and Abstain-0. Robert's Rules were suspended.

T Velasco proposed a secret ballot.

S Lahiri asked for more discussion.

K Jones asked if there were any discussion from this ad hoc committee to support the reorganization.

S Lahiri said he was for reform but felt there were other models than the one proposed. He suggested they should come from faculty and not from the administration. He offered a list of alternatives.

B Ellsworth said it was a dire situation that should be addressed quickly. She added that we have an increased chance of being successful if we come together and support the current model. She was concerned about taking a long time to come up with alternatives.

R Whaley said she saw this proposal as allowing for some elimination but not entire elimination of departments, allowing flexibility. She then asked about tenure at the school level and whether annual review letters would still be done at the department level.

L Chevalier said she saw that as coming from the operating papers. Faculty follow tenure procedures in place at the time of hire.

R Whaley said she was talking about future hires. She said the national trend is department-first decisions about tenure and promotion.

T McCubbin expressed concerns with the wording in paragraph six, the parenthetical "no reason given." She said she felt it was not fair to the administration and asked that it be removed.

W Calvert said that some fair points had been made about the lack of counter proposals. He suggested that according to orderly process in article nine some counter proposals would be in the works. One

concern he had in the ad hoc committee was the possibility that counter proposals would not be taken seriously. He added that different departments may have different needs, which should be listened to. He felt this resolution allowed for this dialogue.

K Jones said she was aware of three university committees that have addressed this structuring over the past 7 years. This process, she said, has been going on for years and faculty had input in the process. She believed it was time to take action. She said the reorganization may not be perfect, but we were at the point that to do nothing meant we would continue to see a decline in enrollment and in enthusiasm for the institution. She expressed her disappointment at the resolution. She said it was given at 4PM the day before with no time to consult with constituencies and that now we were going to vote on it at 9AM. She said that the resolution seemed more like a ramrod than the proposed reorganization.

T Velasco commented that all the resolutions processed by the Graduate Council are always disseminated a day or two before the meeting. He is not going to change this procedure. He suggested to K Jones that if she was going to apply this thinking to this resolution, she has to apply it to all resolutions. He reiterated that this was a time for discussion.

T Haniotakis agreed with K Jones and suggested that a second reading might be necessary. He said he wants time to discuss the resolution with his college. He added that he thought with the proposal, we were missing the debate. The concern was about hiring and tenure rules, for example, that in a bigger unit professors of programs or schools irrelevant to other disciplines may get to vote in this process. The biggest concern, he believes is with the future of operating papers.

K Jones said that the main issue seemed to be with Article 5 regarding operating papers and not Article 9 regarding reorganization. The faculty showed concerns with the provision that the Chancellor is the ultimate dispute resolution entity. They have to put confidence in leadership to protect smaller entities and allow and encourage their representation. This may not have been articulated, she said.

S Lahiri said that most could be done without getting rid of the departments; he is not convinced we need to. He suggested that there can be a similar structure proposal with departments and divisions. If there are contract issues, he said, we could talk to the Faculty Association.

D DiLalla said this had nothing to do with contractual concerns.

S Lahiri asked why we do not just call them departments instead of schools.

T Haniotakis asked whether with the same reorganizations, instead of calling them divisions, we could call them departments.

D DiLalla said this had contractual implications. Departments must contractually have a chair that does work load and annual reviews. With what is being suggested there would also be at the same time a school director that contractually must do work load, annual review, and recommendations for promotion and tenure. There's a conflict between directors and chairs at levels of administration.

S Lahiri clarified that the Chancellor said the director will be providing service.

D DiLalla said that once we call it a department, it contractually must have a chair.

C Montemagno indicated that what S Lahiri was saying was exactly what he is proposing. We just cannot use the word department, right now. It has a specific legal meaning for the policies within the contract.

S Lahiri clarified that this contract was with the Faculty Association. He was uncertain as to whether the administration had engaged them on this issue.

C Montemagno expressed that we had.

D DiLalla responded that we do not take on contract modification while we are under an existing contract. We could create an MOU he supposes and was not opposed to it. He said he was always open to discussions about definitional issues and otherwise.

C Montemagno said that the organizational structure that S Lahiri was talking about is exactly the one he is proposing. He cannot use “department”.

S Lahiri claimed that you can call them departments in agreement with the Faculty Association. He then asked for the faculty to engage this Association.

D DiLalla said he welcomes conversation with the Faculty Association. He said that what S Lahiri was suggesting would involve a waiver for a department within a school, indicating that there wouldn't be a department chair or department operating papers.

C Montemagno said that what S Lahiri was talking about is what is being proposed. The issue is terminology. He said he just cannot use the term “department”. He said he would love to be able to say we are creating new schools that are going to have departments run with faculty members leading them. He reiterated that he cannot do this in the existing framework.

S Lahiri commented that in departments, operational control is designed with subject expertise. If we keep departments then that control is retained.

C Montemagno expressed that those things would be retained now, though we won't call units departments. He believes that when the faculty craft operating papers, they will use the same level of divisional responsibility maintained by a head of division. He restated that he cannot use the word “department.”

S Lahiri said it could be done with an agreement with the Faculty Association.

C Montemagno said there were legal issues described to him that dictate if this issue is opened then the whole contract can be negotiated. Contract negotiations is a long process, he said.

S Lahiri said so were writing up operating papers, which could take years.

C Montemagno added that it will have to be done in a little less than a year as per the contract.

S Lahiri said in his experience with operating papers, even a small change can take years.

D DiLalla said he appreciated the comment from S Lahiri and would reach out to Faculty Association.

W Calvert made the motion to vote on the resolution and it was seconded.

W Calvert requested secret ballot.

The Members voted on the resolution with amendments—paragraph 3, “ore” to “were” and the elimination in paragraph 6 of the parenthetical language “(with, in many cases, no reason given for going against the opinions of the faculty)” —Yes-14, No-5, and Abstain-3. The resolution passed.

C Montemagno stated that when he came on board, he was given a plan that called for him to close graduate programs and close departments. If he does not have a program in place by April, he said he will be forced to initiate that plan.

Report—Dean’s Council, Terry Clark

T Clark said the deans thought continuously about the reorganization and talked about nothing else. He said that the deans were generally in favor of the reorganization. He added that last year, the deans wanted leadership, direction, and action. They feel that the Chancellor is giving that to them. From the deans’ perspective there have been three kinds of meetings across campus: strawman meetings, off strawman meetings, where units have reached out to colleges where they thought they belonged, and individual meetings, in which people have described where they thought they should be. He said that in the past years there had been at least three committees on campus discussing organization and that there has been more discussion about this issue than any other he experienced.

R Whaley wondered if anyone had caught the Chancellor’s words at his departure.

D DiLalla though the Chancellor was referring to the broader concern of the Board in July about financial issues and assuring we had a plan for sustainability going forward. He took the comment to be similar to the one he made earlier, which is that we have to make difficult decisions if we do not implement a plan like this.

Report—Faculty Senate, Ahmad Fakhoury

A Fakhoury said that in the November Faculty Senate meeting, the faculty passed a similar resolution opposing the complete elimination of departments. That resolution was not advanced through an executive committee but was advanced by the Committee for Change and the Faculty Association by a senator. This is not the usual process for resolutions. There was a lively debate that went on for over two hours, he said, and the vote was split: 19 for, 11 against, 3 abstained.

J Flowers said he was aware of two Faculty Senate meetings with the Chancellor. He wondered how the faculty was able to get the Chancellor to agree to a meeting.

A Fakhoury indicated that the Chancellor comes to all of the Faculty Senate meetings and agreed to an additional meeting. The meetings were largely positive.

Report—Council’s Vice Chair, Julie Partridge

J Partridge said that the Faculty Senate additionally voted on a resolution to create an ad hoc committee regarding teaching. That body asked if the Graduate Council would participate. The executive committee and the committee on committees said they would contribute one tenure and one non-tenure graduate faculty. She suggested that the Graduate Council contribute one faculty and one graduate student. She asked for volunteers.

T Haniotakis asked J Partridge to clarify.

J Partridge restated that the Faculty Senate recommended creating an ad hoc committee on graduate teaching. She said she indicated that the Graduate Council was interested.

T Haniotakis asked if this should be the responsibility of the Graduate Council, not the Faculty Senate.

W Calvert said the issue regards graduate teaching in the undergraduate programs which concerns both bodies.

J Partridge said the Graduate Council wants to be a part of the discussion.

T Haniotakis asked if we were discussing TAs or Graduate Teaching in general.

R Whaley responded that this was the question.

J Partridge said that this opens discussion on how graduate teaching impacts programs. The Faculty Senate will provide two members and Graduate Council will provide two for the committee.

Y Lee commented that he thought this was an important initiative and encouraged the Graduate Council to participate. He said this involves the quality of undergraduate education as well as the future success of our graduate students.

J Flowers added that GPSC representatives from the School of Law showed concern about the impact on assistantships at the School of Law. He recommended adding a representative to the committee from the School of Law.

J Partridge said she would pass along the recommendation.

Reports from Standing Committees:

New Programs Committee Report, Wesley Calvert:

First Reading: Resolution in Support of the Addition of an Accelerated MA in History.

W Calvert requested to submit the resolution as written in accordance with Robert's Rules.

Vote to submit the resolution as written: Yes-20, No-0, and Abstain-0

Educational Policies Committee Report, Jennifer Lynn Smith:

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

J Lynn Smith explained that there had been arguments about naming when people tried to create new specializations. The question of the resolution, she said, was whether someone who chooses to use the name from another department needs a letter of concurrence from that department. Our committee felt it was not necessary, because specializations go through the RME process which is exhaustive and public. People who have concerns can speak up during this process. She said M Brown raised a good question. He asked that if this resolution was doing what we are already do then why have it? She responded that the committee wanted it on record that this was the decision.

T Velasco assumed that the catalogue could be changed to reflect the resolution.

T Haniotakis said he would probably be against the resolution. He said he could provide examples of other proposals for specializations outside of disciplines that show that certain people do not know the subject they are proposing to teach. He suggested we should be slow and careful in approving things like this.

T Velasco responded that the letter of concurrence was a letter of dissent and that it was about the specialization only and not about master's degrees.

J Lynn Smith said that the letter added a step to the process. She added that there can still be a time and place for dissent. In the dispute over Analytics, for example, the parties felt they had time to voice concerns and express dissent.

T Velasco reiterated that this was just for specializations and not for degrees.

W Calvert said it was relevant to discuss the working style of the new programs committee. He expressed that the committee looks for entities that seem like they should have a voice and tries to incorporate them in the discussion. The question here is should a department seek out people that do not like the proposal.

T Haniotakis said he was afraid this could cause fights between departments over which specialization belong to which departments. When someone wants to do a specialization, everyone should make sure they do not have objections, he added.

Y Lee indicated that he could see both sides. He expressed the importance of communication between departments. Whether a letter is required, he felt was a different question. It might not be in relation to best practices. He concluded that it was the Graduate Council's job to check these proposals carefully and work with the Provost.

D DiLalla agreed with Y Lee that communication was critical. He said he was agnostic on the necessity of a concurring letter. He added that these proposals are made public on the website, in the Council minutes, everywhere. He said he is open to suggestions for making departments aware of proposals so that they can voice concerns.

T Velasco asked if this would be different than departments with proposals seeking out potential opposition.

D DiLalla said he didn't know but that it was incumbent on all of us to be aware of proposals.

T Haniotakis suggested that whenever a unit goes into new materials, it is made public.

D DiLalla responded that it was public already in so far as minutes are published. Some just aren't paying attention, he said.

T Haniotakis said he didn't feel faculty should have to go through the minutes to find the resolutions.

D DiLalla referenced a tracking database for RMEs. He said there were other ways to post them as well.

J Flowers suggested distributing proposals to a listserv for department chairs. Every time we have an RME it can be sent out to the listserv so chairs can look at them and respond where appropriate. He added that this body reviews those resolutions and that it is not its obligation to talk to every department.

J Lynn Smith suggested that those proposing RMEs google the name of the specialization to see if it is taken.

D DiLalla replied that the listserv would most likely not work. He proposed a dedicated website for all RMEs.

J Lynn Smith said that the RME form had a list of questions already and that one could be added, asking if the name proposed was used by anyone else on campus.

T Haniotakis said he felt this was not enough and that there was too much departmental overlap in courses.

S Lahiri seconded that there was a lot of course duplication.

Research Committee Report, Sajal Lahiri:

No Report

Program Review Committee Report, Sue Rimmer:

No Report

Report from GPSC, Clay Awsumb:

C Awsumb reported that at the GPSC meeting resolutions were passed to fund the Anthropology student's association speaker's series, student Bar association events, and student linguistics association events. They also requested reports from representatives in regards to the second strawman reorganization plan. There was a motion to form an ad hoc committee on academic dishonesty in relation to the student code of conduct. They additionally just held an emergency meeting in response to information they received about the Graduate School and the reassignment of Dean Lee to the Psychology Department. With Dean Lee's reassignment, GPSC did not understand who would be running the Graduate School or how it would function with the number of vacancies already therein. They also wrote a letter of complaint to President Dunn and Vice-President Colwell about this. They have drafted a GPSC position statement on the reorganization proposal. They also addressed a censure towards the conduct of the Chancellor towards graduate level support and changes to the Graduate School personnel—reassignment or cancellation of searches to fill vacancies.

R Whaley asked what would happen to current graduate student related memos and whether there would be someone to make decisions at the Graduate School about those requests.

D DiLalla expressed that decisions would be made, and that his office would communicate at an appropriate time to the campus community changes to the Graduate School. He said he was not going to comment on personnel in this body.

J Lynn Smith asked about whether the Graduate School was slated for elimination in the nonacademic prioritization.

R Whaley replied "no" that the discussion was to merge admissions processes and that the Graduate Council rejected the proposal.

D DiLalla reiterated that the false rumor that the Graduate School was slated for elimination should not be spread.

J Lynn Smith clarified that then the Graduate School was there to stay.

D DiLalla said absolutely, that the operating papers specify that there must be a Graduate Dean. He said his office would follow what was required by the papers and make sure appropriate leadership was in place.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:43 AM.