

2017 Graduate Council

Meeting Minutes

September 7, 2017

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

Members Absent: Norman Carver and Greg Rose

Proxies: Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies and Matthew Keefer for Terry Clark

Ex-Officio Members Present: David DiLalla, James Garvey, Yueh-Ting Lee, Grant Miller, Carlo Montemagno

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:01 AM.

Consideration of Minutes:

The minutes of the last 2016-2017 meeting held May 4, 2017 were passed without amendments.

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes—23 voted in favor.

The minutes of the first 2017-2018 meeting held May 4, 2017 were passed without amendments.

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes—21 voted in favor.

Remarks—Chancellor Carlo Montemagno

Chancellor Montemagno introduced himself and described, briefly, his three weeks as chancellor at SIUC. He said that it had been a very busy three weeks and that the University had many things to accomplish. He then addressed enrollment challenges, citing them as a significant threat to SIUC's mission as a comprehensive research university. In the coming weeks, he said, there is going to be a lot of activity in transitioning who we are and what we do to make sure that we are able to accomplish the University's mission.

In the last week, the Chancellor's Office engaged in a survey to which all stake holders were asked to respond; the closing date for that survey is September 8th. The Chancellor indicated that the preliminary results of those surveys show an overwhelming affirmation of the commitment to excellence, to inclusion, and to outward connection to the community. These results stand as the model, he said, the keystone, for how we reposition and advance the Institution.

The Chancellor then addressed the members of the council, telling them that he looked forward to working with all of them. He told them that things are going to happen soon at a pace which is not typical for most academic institutions. The pace is dictated by the gravity of recent events.

The Chancellor specified that in the last ten years, the University lost nearly \$200 million in tuition. That \$200 million is money that could have been used for hiring new faculty, paying for raises, advancing infrastructure, initiating new initiatives. Chancellor Montemagno then commented on SIUC's relationship to the community. Even using a 5 to 1 (normally 7 to 1) impact, the University and the surrounding community lost \$1 billion of economic activity as a result of what has happened in the last 10 years. This activity is significant and cannot continue if the University wishes to move forward.

The Chancellor then mentioned the steepening decline in enrollment. In response, SIUC will soon begin a process in which people are going to need to be engaged, leave their own priorities at the door, and put SIUC first. Everyone should think about what is best for the Institution and work collaboratively to craft appropriate solutions. The University is going to have a busy fall, but the Chancellor is absolutely convinced in his brief time here of the commitment of the faculty, staff, and students to this Institution. The survey made clear that people still believe in this institution and its mission for success. SIUC has a number of natural attributes for advancing itself, and now it is time for it to utilize them. The Chancellor reiterated that he looked forward to working closely with the Graduate Council to recraft and recreate the next generation of SIUC. He concluded with a thanks to the Council.

W Babcock commented that over the last 10 years, during which time the university was losing so many students, SIUC still remained a unique Research 1 institution with a first-generation, blue-collar constituency. He asked the Chancellor for his opinion as to why, with this fact in mind, it has been so hard for the administration to sell this uniqueness.

Chancellor Montemagno responded that he agreed with W Babcock. The Chancellor reminded everyone that he had been at the University only three weeks and that he could not speak to the decisions that were or were not made in the past. He could say what the facts are now and what the University has to do going forward. He said that it does not do any good to labor on what decisions should have been made and what actions should have been taken. The University needs to focus on the circumstances that were presented and work to craft a new solution.

Chancellor Montemagno then addressed W Babcock's comment about the uniqueness of the institution directly. SIUC, he stated, is an institution that since its founding almost 150 years ago has focused on inclusion. It is one of the hallmarks that has and continues to differentiate SIUC from other universities. Why that has not been embraced or communicated effectively, why the university has not messaged it properly, and why its educational programs have not been evolving to take into account changes in educational technology, the Chancellor could not

say. He stressed that, regardless, now the University has to do these above things. It is going to require a large number of campus leaders stepping up and making this happen.

S Hart of GPSC commented that last semester Brad Colwell had stated that he felt the outside community, via various media, may have painted the university in a negative light. She said that a GPSC representative had asked him then what the University's relationship was with these entities, about the relationship with some SIUC students who work for or with them; what does that relationship with those groups look like. He said he was not sure. S Hart then asked the Chancellor how he felt about having a relationship with these entities and how to address them while recrafting and recreating the image of this Institution.

Chancellor Montemagno responded that the issue is not just with the image of SIUC, but was also with the image of Carbondale. They are intertwined. The Chancellor said that he has met with the mayor, the City Council, the Chamber of Commerce and has opened an ongoing dialogue. In a meeting 3 days prior to the Graduate Council meeting, he and these individuals scheduled a series of monthly meetings in which they will determine how to best partner-up on the things both constituencies want to do together moving forward. The Chancellor did emphasize that the University is responsible for crafting and communicating its own narrative. Who we are as a university is what we communicate and say. If the University allows other people to craft its narrative, others who may not have the University's best interests in mind and will craft a narrative that fits their own interests. Crafting and communicating does not just occur with the Chancellor's office or at the diaconal level, but also occurs at the faculty level. The faculty must communicate about SIUC with other faculty when at conferences, for example, and with people outside of the Institution. All of us are SIUC ambassadors and are responsible for recrafting and communicating the SIUC image. Chancellor Montemagno then referenced the increased media profile since he started in his capacity. He reminded the Council that SIUC is a destination institution that will allow all students the chance to strive for excellence and graduate into a great career. He concluded that SIUC was going to discover new things over the coming months which it will employ and translate to the local economy. SIUC is a great university and needs to communicate that.

T Velasco asked for further questions for the Chancellor. Receiving none, the Chairperson thanked the Chancellor and concluded that portion of the remarks.

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

D DiLalla began by welcoming everyone and indicating that Co-Chairperson L Chevalier could not be in attendance. He explained their roles, telling the members that they were asked to assist in covering duties for the provost's office after Dr. Ford's retirement in June. They were pleased to assist and have been busy. Since the Chancellor's arrival, they have collected information to help assist the Chancellor in getting his arms around the issues that face this campus. They worked hard to get the semester underway, which D DiLalla thought went smoothly. He expressed his hope that this was the case in all academic units. Their office is

going to continue to report on the initiatives that the Chancellor talked about above. D DiLalla reiterated that the challenges around enrollment are everyone's challenges and that recruitment and retention is everyone's responsibility from top to bottom. The office will work at engaging the entire university community in that process. It is the single biggest thing we control as far as our financial fate as a University. D DiLalla concluded by expressing his to be working with the Council.

S Lahiri asked for clarification about alleged drops in enrollment at other Illinois, state universities.

Chancellor Montemagno indicated that he did not that the University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana had not dropped and if it did was the drop was small enough to be in the noise of the calculations. Illinois State University, he said, dropped 0.1 % or 20 students. SIUC lost a lot of students to the budget. For Example, Chancellor Montemagno said that Indiana University increased their Illinois enrolment by 60%, harvesting a bunch of students from Illinois this past year. Arguably this is because of the budget impasse, though the Chancellor was not sure. He expressed that he thought there was a lot of bad messaging going on that left people very uncomfortable about the State of Illinois' universities. SIUC did take a pretty significant hit.

D DiLalla qualified that he had no doubt that living in the State of Illinois contributed to where we are; however to on that as the sole or major contributor to the issue is not helpful.

S Lahiri said that he was not suggesting that it was the sole contributor.

K Jones first thanked the Chancellor for coming. She expressed that some of the challenges SIUC faces have been due to instability among the leadership ranks, especially with our alumni and stakeholder contingencies. She then asked the chancellor if he had an idea for filling in open positions. As admirable a job as D DiLalla and and L Chevalier are doing, K Jones said she felt their roles were only a temporary solution. K Jones asked if the Chancellor had any thoughts on this.

Chancellor Montemagno responded first to the question of D DiLalla and L Chevalier's positions. He said he was going to keep their positions where they were until the springtime. For the changes SIUC needs to undergo, it would be difficult to recruit the talent that he wants during restructuring. He insisted that we need to get the path forward identified to effectively get the leader that he wants. D DiLalla and L Chevalier do a phenomenal job, and there has been no apparent negative impacts on the Institution since asking them to take over duties. The diversity position, he said, he will look into filling in late fall. There is going to be a major restructuring of the leadership positions. SIUC has to become leaner at the top and allow more resources to flow down. He said he does not want to hire someone and then say to them their job is gone either. The Chancellor said that SIUC would start with a blank slate and get a broad idea of what organization will look like, what the financial implications of it will be, before sharing with the community. He wants to involve the community in figuring out where the pieces fit in this new structure. This will give the University general organizational details; then

the faculty will be asked to fill in the details. Chancellor Montemagno said that the transformation SIUC is embarking on is every bit as big as the first transformation it made from a normal school to a 1 program, two building university to its transition again to a comprehensive research university. He reminded the Council that all are going to be part of this, a daunting but exciting task to contribute to the next 150 years of SIUC.

Chancellor Montemagno added that he had begun a national search for an enrollment management leader. SIUC has hired a search firm to get somebody involved who is an expert in enrollment. The Chancellor said he is fast tracking this search and the goal is to have somebody here and in place by the end of the semester.

Remarks—Interim Vice-Chancellor for Research, James Garvey

James Garvey began by addressing last year's negative impact on research. He said that the University was affected last year on multiple sides and many thought this might continue as a trend. J Garvey assured the room that it had not continued. He could say that grants have rebounded and state and federal support had increased in respect to last year four-fold already. In fact, he had just been informed that two, on-campus investigators recently received NIH awards. J Garvey then addressed the rumor that research is waning at this University. It is not true, and in fact our researchers are more productive than ever. The Interim Vice-Chancellor expects that research productivity will continue as SIUC hires new faculty. He and the Chancellor both wish to increase SIUC's research profile and get the University up into another energy level from where it has been for a while, around the \$70 million range. He reiterated that research productivity dollars is only one measure of success, but is unfortunately what the nation looks at as important in determining research productivity. When the University brings in external dollars it allows us to support other research that may not have the capability to bring in the big NIH, NSF, USDA, or Department of Defense grants. SIUC will continue to be committed to research productivity.

J Garvey encouraged anyone looking to go out for external funding, whether it's a \$1 million or \$1,000 grant, to definitely contact him or his office to make the process as painless as possible. He asked for everyone placing requests into his office to stay within a 48-72 hour deadline. He expressed his disconcertion with the impression that the research office is doing everything it can to deter people from doing research. That is not the case. He and his office do as much possible to make sure that everyone gets good grants, but there are also responsibilities associated with those grants. Federal compliance is something investigators always have to deal with. If an investigator works with animal subjects or human subjects that is a responsibility that all have to take seriously. If an investigator is dealing with any public dollars, or private for that matter, again she needs to be careful how she spends it. Fines and legal problems can be severe and costly for the University and the individual. J Garvey indicated that it was his offices job to protect the University and investigators. The Interim Vice-Chancellor concluded by indicating he would address specific University goings-on at a future meeting.

Remarks—Graduate School Dean, Yueh-Ting Lee

Dean Lee begin his remarks by discussing graduate student enrollment. He said the University currently has about 3,000 (specifically 2,957) graduate students. Dean Lee then compared this number with last year's data. The University lost 226 students from 2016 or roughly 7%. The University has 2029 students currently in master's programs, a decrease in 127 students or 6%, and has 881 students in doctoral programs, down 102 students or about 10%. The College of Applied Sciences gained by 22% in master's level, tuition paying students. Colleges of Education, Engineering, and MCMA lost the most students.

Dean Lee then shared good news about best practices. He said that at the end of August 2015, the University had over 1200 no-decision (non-processed) applications. At the end of 2017, the University had only 220 no-decision applications, demonstrating significant progress in terms of our best practices. The Dean feels that the Graduate School has made a big difference by working collaboratively and persistently. The Dean then thanked the Graduate Council, college deans, graduate directors and faculty for their collaboration and support in these outcomes. Positive outcomes are important for prospective students and external auditors.

Dean Lee then said that the Graduate School's external advisory board had its first successful meeting on July 14, 2017. Its 19 members attended in person or via skype. J Partridge and J Flowers were also invited to attend. The board approved the Advisory Board's Guidelines. Dean Lee indicated that at the meeting he gave an annual report on the strategic directions and fundraising activities for SIUC.

On August 10, 2017, Dean Lee, Dean Scott Ishman (College of Science), Chair Julie Dunston (Engineering Technology), and Chair Stephen Esling (Geology) attended the STEM fair at Harris Stowe State University in St. Louis. They conducted a productive meeting with the Provost and several deans, discussing the strengthening of SIU and Harris Stowe State's partnership. They also recruited 25 prospective African American students for SIUC.

The Dean concluded by listing a number of upcoming events, including two training sessions/workshops for new chairs and directors (to be held September 26, 2017 in the morning and September 27 in the afternoon). He also reminded members of the October 1, 2017 deadline for new catalogue 2018-2019 submissions (Form 90) and that the fall 2017 *Graduate Saluki Stories* will be coming out shortly.

S Lahiri asked for clarification on when Dean Lee intended to go digital with the catalogue.

Dean Lee said that L Chevalier had that information, but that he could say the digitalization was an ongoing process and that if chairs or directors missed the deadline, they could still submit information; that information may not be included in the 2018-2019 catalogue.

T Haniotakis asked if Dean Lee had the data of how many tuition paying students there were currently per faculty. T Haniotakis clarified that he was not talking simply about enrollment.

Dean Lee asked for clarification whether T Haniotakis meant on- or off-campus tuition paying students.

T Haniotakis indicated that he meant on-campus graduate students.

Dean Lee said that there are approximately 500 tuition paying students.

T Haniotakis further asked if the Dean had a ratio of those 500 to the number of faculty.

Dean Lee said that he did not currently have that information but could find it.

W Babcock asked if Dean Lee could elaborate on the quality of graduate student this year in relation to the last few years.

Dean Lee responded that in the last year the Graduate School had started a strategic discussion on continued academic excellence that does not just focus solely on enrollment. In the past two and a half years, the quality of SIUC's graduate program and graduate students has remained outstanding. Dean Lee elaborated that in the last year SIUC graduates had continued to present their research at conferences and had received many national and international awards. Nearly 100 applications over the last year and a half had been submitted for conference presentations.

W Babcock then asked about the tests scores of incoming students.

Dean Lee said that some departments require the GRE and some do not. For TOEFL, SIUC uses the same standard University-wide.

W Babcock asked if scores had increased or decreased.

Dean Lee said that scores have been maintained as the standards are established by the graduate school.

S Lahiri asked about the enrollment of international students, whether it had dropped.

Dean Lee answered that in terms of applications, based on data from the end of the summer, SIUC lost 20% of its international graduate applications. The national environment and G.A. budget had negative impacts on this number. SIUC dropped 20-25% in applications from India and China, Saudi Arabian and South Asian applications also declined.

D DiLalla said it is definitely a challenge in this environment, but Dr. Carver has been working on international enrollment diligently. The Chancellor, in fact, received something the day before the meeting from a potential international partner. That information was passed along to Dr. Carver.

S Lahiri asked what the 10-day count was for international students.

D DiLalla responded that he did not currently know the 10-day count for international students.

Dean Lee too said he had not seen the data, yet he estimated that SIUC lost 5-10% of its international student population.

Remarks—Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Lizette Chevalier

No Remarks

Report—Council Chair, Tomás Velasco

T Velasco said that he had sent the faculty information about “speed-networking” with SIUE. SIUC made formal contact with the Graduate Council at SIUE in May and April of last year. Efforts will continue in opening channels for communication and perhaps establishing a protocol for researchers at SIUC who are interested in interacting with SIUE faculty. Those interested in participating in this “speed-networking” need to contact T Velasco so that he may forward those names to the SIUE graduate council. A first formal event will soon be hosted by SIUE, and SIUC will join via skype. The idea is for SIUC faculty to collaborate with SIUE faculty in research efforts.

T McCubbin asked if the Chair, in saying “those” who were interested in this collaboration, was referring to only the people present at the Graduate Council that morning.

T Velasco responded no and that everyone had the opportunity to collaborate with SIUE faculty. Those on the Graduate Council could communicate this to other faculty in their colleges and departments. SIUC is simply trying to establish a more formal collaboration with its sister institution SIUE.

J Lynn Smith asked about efforts to collaborate on programs that supplement SIUC’s or SIUE’s course and degree offerings.

T Velasco said he believes it can be done but that he is not aware of specific situations.

J Partridge said that during the Skype conversation something like this did come up and that maybe by starting this collaboration on a more formal level these opportunities may arise.

W Calvert spoke to an example of an exploration that took place when SIUE initiated formal talks about a joint graduate degree in mathematics. It was determined SIUE was not going to gain anything from the relationship, and it was decided not to pursue the program any further. He imagined talks like this happen in many places.

Dean Lee then discussed the meeting referenced in his above remarks. He reiterated that emphasis was on collaborative research; however, he indicated that if a situation is determined to be win-win for both Universities, he can work with the Dean of the Graduate School at SIUE to make sure a joint program is a success. This occurred with the joint PhD in ERP. Both Universities will have to consider their own interests, but a joint PhD program has the potential to benefit both.

Action Item

Second Reading: Resolution in Support of the Addition of a Special Education Post-Baccalaureate Certificate.

The members voted on the resolution: Yes-22, No-0, and Abstain-0

The resolution was passed.

Report—Dean's Council, M. Keefer proxy for Terry Clark

M Keefer stated that the Dean's Council had received no less than four detailed requests for information in the prior three weeks. These requests ranged from questions about the new Chancellor's own perceived strengths and weaknesses to what faculty consider to be the vision for their units. Most of the latter work was done with the chairs and directors of the colleges. Other requests had to do with the University's capacities, where more sections can be opened for courses, where faculty are needed in cases where G.A.s are doing a lot of the teaching. Additionally, the council looked at who SIUC considers its aspirational peers to be. This is an exercise to think about what institutions SIUC considers itself to be like and what institutions it aspires to be more like in the future. M Keefer also referred back to the questionnaire that everyone had a chance to fill out. Responses are going to be used to meet the goals and deadlines that the Chancellor has spoken about. M Keefer considers the Dean's Council to be usefully employed in strategically determining who we are and where we are headed, though he could not say what the next steps are specifically.

Report—Faculty Senate, Grant Miller

G Miller reported that the Faculty Senate had not met as a body yet this cycle year but would do so the following week. There had been an executive committee meeting that offered those involved the chance to meet the new chancellor. Next week, the Senate will have resolutions concerning programs in child and family services, hospitality and tourism, and management. One resolution concerns the program review procedures and both internal and external reviewers. Also, the judicial review board process for elections is open and the ballots would be available for nominations in October.

A Ortiz confirmed that ballots for nominations would be made available sometime in October.

Report—Council Vice Chair, Julie Partridge

J Partridge said that she is currently looking for volunteers for the final exam committee. That committee will be tasked with setting policies related to final exam schedules, etc. Wanli Zhao was the previous representative on that committee, but is no longer working in that capacity. The Vice Chair said that she had not gotten an answer yet on how many years remain on the term of service; however, if anyone is interested they are to contact her. She was not aware of any restriction on the college/discipline that the representative comes from.

J Partridge also mentioned updates to the grievance policy. No changes had been made this year, so far. Deb Nelson, whom J Partridge has worked with, did suggest that the language in parts could be made clearer. This committee will also be working closely with J Lynn Smith and the Educational Policies Committee.

Dean Lee added that the number of grievances indicates that there are some areas that we need to approve upon. He also agreed with J Partridge that some of the policies needed updated, improved, or revised through work with the Graduate Council. Dean Lee reminded the Council that on September 25 and 26, there is to be training for new chairs and directors, training that should help reduce grievances. Grievances in many cases come from the lack of understanding of certain policies, including but not limited to admissions, records, contract issues, and degree completion. For some reason a faculty member may not be aware of all policies. The Council and faculty should seek additional training to minimize cases.

S Lahiri asked for clarification on the kinds of grievances being discussed.

Dean Lee said he referred to general grievances, many being about grades and some about degree completion.

Report from Standing Committees

New Programs Committee: Wesley Calvert

W Calvert indicated that the entirety of the committee's report is contained in the previous action item.

Research Committee Report: Sajal Lahiri

S Lahiri said that the committee had scheduled a meeting for the following week.

Educational Policies Committee: Jennifer Lynn Smith

J Lynn Smith said there was nothing to report except that the committee would be working closely with J Partridge on the grievance policy.

Program Review Committee: Sue Rimmer

S Rimmer said that there are at least 8 reviews to be done in the fall, and that she would be contacting committees for meetings. Also, the Assistant Provost pulled back on process changes discussed in the previous year. This allows for some flexibility for departments under the current budget situation.

R Whaley asked what, if anything, the faculty senate was doing as far as program reviews.

G Miller responded that the Senate was currently looking at policies in relation to internal vs external reviewers; this is where that flexibility comes into play. He said right now it looks like there will be some desktop reviews.

R Whaley said that last year the committee had had some concerns with the proposals but then discussions were put on hold.

S Rimmer answered that she had talked to L Chevalier the day before and that this issue was considered to be under a past administration and that it was time to move forward.

Report from GPSC: Clay Awsumb

C Awsumb reported that GPSC had held its first meeting on Tuesday and that executives had been elected. C Awsumb also indicated that he had no new resolutions for the committee at that point. GPSC did come up with a list of priorities for the coming year. It would like to continue to emphasize shared governance. GPSC expects the council to keep it updated on the anticipated changes to policies that are coming. GPSC wishes to be a continual part of that discussion through shared governance, thus assuring continued graduate professional involvement in the process.

GPSC also would like to continue to emphasize the University's mission for diversity on campus. GPSC will broaden its understanding and implementation of graduate student and graduate professional support on campus.

Maintaining student excellence is also a key focus for GPSC. What can the University do to continue the retention and success of graduate students? GPSC will promote goals through improved graduate professional representation and extended opportunities for graduate professionals to solicit views and communicate those views to the University.

During his time with GPSC, C Aswumb has documented some concerns with the previous administration. One key concern that caused unnecessary stress was the problem/ limitation of communication about administrative actions being taken, why they were being taken, the purpose of those actions, and how they would come back to affect graduate students and professionals. Communication is key considering how quickly the changes will come and the fact that they may not be coming in ways that fit with tradition. C Aswumb did express his wish that the administration had stayed for GPSC's portion of the meeting.

Additionally, GPSC would like to know where academic prioritization sits with the current administration's plans, where all of the faculty sweeps are taking place, and where the money for the next \$11 million dollar payment from SIUC will be coming from.

T Velasco said that he had begun talks with the Faculty Senate and that a town hall is in the process of being scheduled. He indicated that these questions might be best answered at this forum.

J Lynn Smith asked about the general status of academic prioritization.

T Velasco stated that this could best be answered by the Co-Provost, who was not present.

M Keefer commented that the process was not complete, was open but would not remain open long.

G Miller said that the Chancellor stressed academic prioritization as a tool for information not necessarily as a tool for decision making. Prioritization should reflect where a program has been not where it will be in the future. The Chancellor considers it weak leadership to use metrics and not a vision to make decisions. He will use the information to determine aspirational peers, to track increases or decreases in enrollment, but not as the final determiners for decisions.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 AM