

Graduate Council 2022-2023

April 6, 2023

Members present: Jeremy Allen, Heidi Bacon, Lisa Brooten, Jason Dallas, Craig Gingrich-Philbrook, Matthew McCarroll, Tomas Velasco, Zvi Rosen, Kyle Plunkett, Rachel Nozicka, Eric Brevik, Buffy Ellsworth, Usha Lakshmanan, Myla Burton, Robert Morgan, Bethany Rader, Liliana Lefticariu, John Pollitz, Nwamaka Anaza, Chris Wienke, Iraklis Anagnostopoulos, Ed O'Donnell, Scott Collins, Alicia Utecht.

Executive-Officio: Costas Tsatsoulis, Andrew Youpa

Guests: Ryan Netzley, Julie Lindsey, Crystal Harris, Mike Eichholz.

Meeting started at 8:00 AM

Consideration of the minutes of the previous meeting

Gingrich-Philbrook: Our first order business is to do the approval of the minutes. Were there any observations about the minutes?

Brevik: I do have one change to make. On page 4 in the report that Karen gave on the 3-minute competition. It, says Garrett Williams, out of art science, it should be agricultural science.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Okay. Is there another?

Gingrich-Philbrook: Hearing None, do we have the motion to approve the minutes?

O'Donnell: I move for the minutes as amended.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you and is someone willing to second that?

Ellsworth: I second.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you. Would you please write Yes, minutes in the chat If you are willing to approve the minutes and then, No or abstain, if that is your vote?

Minutes approved (19-0-0)

Gingrich-Philbrook: I see that we have Co. Provost Rob Morgan with us, Rob, are you ready to give us a report?

Remarks from Co-Provost: Robert Morgan

Morgan: Good morning, good to see everybody. I just have a few things not specifically related to undergraduate education, but just a reminder that we have an emergency threat drill coming up on April 20th. We are trying to make sure we get the word out to all our student's faculty and staff as well, particularly our students, to ensure that they have opted for the alerts. So, we are asking faculty across the University to continue highlighting this in classes and informing students how to opt-in on those alerts.

Second, we have worked for a while on revising the policy regarding probation and suspension. We are proposing to do away with the probation terminology that could be triggering for some members depending on parts of the country they come from and the experience it might have had so changing that to a warning system with multiple levels of warnings before getting to suspension and that is at the undergraduate level again, I recognize the graduate council, but with that in place, I think Costas will talk about it, and he is looking at possibly some similar review of policy at the graduate level.

Lastly, I am just working now on enrollment projections. So, Wendell Williams Vice Chancellor for enrollment presented to the cabinet some real potential promise for our largest class coming in this fall. The numbers look exciting; the number of students that have accepted scholarships is well above what we were trending in previous years. So, we are excitedly optimistic about a large incoming class, and that has taken the focus of our time over the last 2 to 6 weeks. So that is what I have, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Questions for Provost

O'Donnell: Can you give us an update on the status of a search for a permanent dean for the College of Business?

Morgan: We are waiting until the provost is in place and we expect Provost Tucker to be here in the summer, and interim Provost Morris will hold the interim position until a search is completed, and we expect a search to commence early after she gets here, but that will be under her charge.

O'Donnell: Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I have a question about the drill since talking with students, can you talk a little bit about what that will look like? so if I think about preparing students for the drill, what sorts of various first responders will be on campus?

Morgan: Let me give a little bit more information on that, Craig. This is information you can share, and we are hoping to get the information out because we want to avoid any surprises. We are also not closing the campus, because there is minimal benefit if we run a drill when nobody is here, but we want to make sure everybody is aware that there is a drill. For example, some alerts went out Tuesday morning regarding a shooting on or near campus, which was not a drill and was not a warning, which was an update. There is a significant difference, so the number one thing is we need to make sure faculty staff, and students are opted in on the alert system. If they are not opted in, they do not get the information. We are looking at changing that to opt-out, so that once somebody becomes affiliated with the university, either by employment or by enrollment, they are automatically opted in, and if they do not no longer want to receive the alerts they have to opt-out, but we are not there right now, so, anybody that wants the alerts need to opt-in. In terms of the actual drill, it is going to be very structured, we are not closing campus and we are not canceling classes because we need to see how everything works regarding the drill. There are multiple purposes here to prepare people to know how to respond and react in the unfortunate event of an incident, but also it is a learning exercise. We need to learn what we need to know and what we need to do differently in the event of an unfortunate

emergency crisis here on our campus. It happened nationally; we see it on the news every day, so we must be prepared, and part of being prepared is practice, but also learning what we do not know or how things will work. So, what will happen is that the alerts will go off, it is going to be a very structured exercise, it is scripted and there will be actors acting out scripts. They have been rehearsing they have been practicing and there will be law enforcement responding to the scene of the incident. We have those locations identified, but we are not releasing that information, so that all of campus, when they receive the alerts, must decide what their response is and what their reaction will be. We are trying to make sure we get the word out that the responses are run, hide, fight. That is the general practice that law enforcement recommends. If you can get away, you run, you flee, you leave campus whatever the case may be. If you are in the location of the incident, and it would not be safe to run, then you should lock down and hide and barricade yourself somewhere and in the unfortunate circumstance where a perpetrator would breach where you are hiding, then, unfortunately, you are fighting for your life. That is the reality of shooter situations and so we are going to mirror that, and we are asking all constituent groups across campus to respond accordingly. So that is the basic scenario, again it is going to be scripted, and there will be no gunshots. We will not shoot blanks or anything like that, because we do not want to again trigger people in and cause more stress than we know this will already cause, but everything else will be real. There will be victims, emergency responders, and the campus will be notified to take action to protect and preserve life.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thanks! That is helpful.

Morgan: Anything else that would be helpful there correct or anybody else?

Brooten: I have a question first; how does one opt into these alerts? And then, secondly, when is this happening again?

Morgan: The date is April 20th which has been released, and you can share that date. We are trying to ensure that nobody is surprised on that day. So, on April 20th, share it widely and with the opt-in on the alert, if you go to the SIU emergency threat page, there are instructions there on how to respond. There is also a link there unfortunately, you

must click a couple of links to get to the opt-in process, but when the meeting moves on, and I am done with my report, I will be staying on, and I will find the link and post it in the chat. But we want that link out there widely, it shares information on how to respond, but it also gives the link to opt-in on the alerts. So, for example, if you did not receive an alert on Tuesday about a shooting on or near campus via text, then you are not in the system and you are strongly encouraged to go into the system, enter your cell phone, and then you are in.

Brevik: I would add to what Bob said, and it was on Tuesday, I believe, also Chief Ben Newman, sent the email out to campus, and the link to get on to the alert, and all the directions to do it are in that email. So, if you search your email from Benjamin Newman. I should. It should be in there.

Morgan: Thank you, Eric.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Are there any other questions? Okay, Thank you very much, Bob. Let us hear from Costas next.

Remarks from Vice-Chancellor for Research/Dean of the Graduate School: Costas Tsatsoulis

Tsatsoulis: Good morning. Also, I wanted to point out to the students working on this Zoom call that if you have this alert, you know, you can leave class, which is extremely important, so please opt in.

I have a few things to report, so let me share my screen. I want to show you where we are right now in terms of admissions and applications. So, on the screen, you can see that as of last week, we had about 2,000 applicants, and we have admitted more than twice as many students as last year. Part of it is because, with the permission of this group who are able to not calculate the GPA after departments have done so, and enrolled students, and for international students, we have not asked for their financial information until they get admitted which case, we need to issue an I-20. Since talking about international students here in the international applicants, two-thirds of our applications and two-thirds of our admittances are international, and we are working hard

to ensure that I-20s are issued. You must keep it in mind when you look at our numbers, several I-20s are quote, unquote pending. This does not mean that they are sitting at somebody's desk, it means that we have contacted the students, who need to provide the financial information, but they have not responded. That means One of two things, either, they have chosen to go to another university, or they have still not collected enough financial information to be able to do so.

I also wanted to show you the numbers compared to the last four years. So, this year you can see our master's versus Ph.D. applications we want both to grow but the master's applications have grown in 2020 and 2021, and slight outliers because of covid since, as you saw, two-thirds of our graduate student applicants are internationals, but we need to look at the fact that we have admitted more than twice master students. Master Students in all programs are, of course, contributing to the research and scholarship, and creative pursuits, but at the same time, they are also the major financial supporters of the university. There are a lot of them that just come here to get their master's degree and move on. Doctoral applicants, on the other hand, almost all of them at SIU, more than 90% of them are supported by the University by Grants, or some other way, and in most programs, they are the major drivers of research, and I am glad to see that although our application numbers are a little bit lower than last year, our admission numbers are almost twice as many, so that is very good.

The other thing I wanted to show you is in terms of trends weeks before classes, last week was 20 weeks before class and I know we are so close to classes now so you will see that there is a bump around 7 months, 6 months before class, but after that the numbers go down. We do not expect a huge increase in the applications for a couple of months, then we get another bump based on students who maybe were delayed in submitting their application or maybe did not get into the school of their first choice, and then they apply to as SIUC, so I do not expect these numbers to grow greatly based on historical trends but we will see some increases in June. The students who apply late for the summer, the international students, will not be able to join us in the fall because there is not enough time for them to receive an I-20 to make an appointment to meet with the

Embassy staff. The information we have is that depending on what country and appointment, it may take 2 to 16 weeks, so it is improbable that a lot of these international students will be able to join us before spring. On the screen, this is the same information, but divided between graduate and international applications, and you would see they have similar trends. They have tapered down by now, and they will go up again in June.

The last thing I want to talk to you about now is in terms of the Vice Chancellor's research, I have met with Senator Duckworth's Staff, and the Dean, to send me some research priorities that are communicated with the staff and we will see where that goes.

- On Monday we had a Let's Talk research workshop and we focused on NSF. We had six panelists from our faculty and thirty-one attendees, so attendance was robust.
- On May 5th, we have a new workshop that will be focusing on young investigators. So, if you have faculty or mentoring somebody, or a colleague within 3 to 5 years of joining SIU as assistant professors, please tell them we will be focusing on the young investigator awards. Not just the career award, but also the young investigator awards across all agencies. Most of those are for STEM, STEM education, or STEM-related faculty, but there are many NAA and NAH awards for junior faculty.
- On May 25th, we have a scheduled talk by an NSF program director. She will talk primarily about transitioning our NSF Funds work from research to industry or spin-off companies, and so on. This new program by itself was created under the CHIPS and Science Act, It is the only new NSF Directorate in like 25 years.

I would like to thank the Research Committee who reviewed eight proposals for equipment support, two of those will be funded, but others could not be funded right now although they were deemed. They should have received funding because of the size of the proposal compared to the size of the money we have right now, so this will be moved to the next quarter.

Finally, in terms of performance our faculties are doing fantastic, we have had almost fifty-seven million dollars in awards as of the end of February, compared to Fifty-three and a half million all year last year. With research awards, these are classified as research versus service or other, we were about fourteen million compared to Eighteen million of all last year and I expect that we will surpass that by the end of June. Proposals are close to Eighty-Nine million compared to One Hundred and Sixty-five million, all last year, but I know that the staff are going crazy with submitting proposals in April and May and these are the highest times for proposal submissions, and I expect it again to pass 165 million. So, Mr. Chairman, that is all I had, any questions?

Questions for Vice-Chancellor for Research/Dean of the Graduate School

Lakshmanan: I have a question just a clarification about the young investigator award. Could you tell me what the eligibility criterion is?

Tsatsoulis: It depends on the agency, usually you have to be within 3 to 5 years from being appointed a faculty member, you don't have to be tenure track in some cases, and also depending again on the agency eligibility, since you received your Ph.D. and then some of them require permanent residency or citizenship while others do not and it's very difficult to guess which one it is. For example, DARPA, you would imagine, requires citizenship, but they do not. On the other hand, NASA does so, every agency is slightly different, and one of the things that we will do in the workshop is described and discuss these differences to ensure that the faculty know if they are eligible or not, and of course, also the submission deadlines differ.

Lakshmanan: Well, the reason I asked, was that it is a bit ambiguous because it says young investigator, and I was wondering whether young also applied to age, and that there was an age restriction, you know but thankfully not. But I can imagine how that would be misleading people.

Tsatsoulis: I understand. It is a good point, but that is what the agencies call, young investigators, and the assumption is that they mean that they are new to the discipline.

Also, a lot of them require that you have not had another Federal grant, which is the whole point but that is a good point. We will make sure that we call it. I do not know.

Lakshmanan: A junior or something else, but because when I first heard the word young, of course, in terms of how I visualized it. I see a young faculty member, but we certainly do not have only people of that type entering the faculty.

Tsatsoulis: Dr. Morgan suggested early career and that is another way of putting it. Again, we will smit it to make sure that nobody feels that they should be excluded.

Lakshmanan: Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Anyone else? Thank you very much. Standing in for Karen Jones with us today is Crystal Harris. Crystal is acting primarily as a messenger that some of the things that Karen has been working on, and we talked a little bit about this role, and she will be happy to answer questions to the best of her ability, but her primary work here today is to kind of talk to us about what has been going on in that office. Welcome, Crystal, and thanks for coming.

Remarks from Associate Dean & Director of Graduate School: Crystal Harris, for Karen Jones

Harris: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. Dr. Jones gave me one update, and it was regarding Grad Council nominations. The nominations have been received and emails have been sent to Faculty, who were nominated. They were given a deadline of Monday, April 10th, to let us know if they will accept the nomination, and once that is done, the elections will be completed. Her goal is to have this completely completed before she says our next executive meeting on April 20th. and that was the only report she had.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Are there any questions about that?

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thanks so much, Crystal. I appreciate you coming today. Let us hear from Dean Pollitz from the Library of Affairs.

Remarks from Dean of Library Affairs: John Pollitz

Pollitz: I do not have too much to report; I would like to congratulate Crystal Harris, Jeremy Allen, and the College of Health and Human Sciences on their awards at the Diversity Champions Lunch the other day. This was the first time I was there, and it was very impressive and good to see you all here. I just want people to know that this afternoon at five O'clock, we are having an author talk, book reading, and signing by Rafael Frumkin, who is an assistant professor in the English Department. He has a new book out, called "Confidence." It is a delightful read, and it was published by Simon and Schuster, and it just had a full-page review in Sunday's New York Times Review book. So, this is going places and it should be a lot of fun, He is an interesting guy. That is all I have today. Any questions?

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you.

Report from Council Chair: Craig Gingrich-Philbrook

Gingrich-Philbrook: For my report, I want to start with our guest Mike Eichholz who sent a Pdf of the report about which he will speak to all our emails. Mike, thanks for coming.

Guest: Mike Eicholz, re: Faculty Senate's salary equity study

Eichholz: I apologize for not getting that report to you sooner. It was just an oversight on my part. I realized this morning that I had not sent that out, so I wanted to make sure you got it. So, I am going to share my screen and what I would like to do is take about ten minutes just to update you on what this group has been doing. So, the committee consists of the individuals you see on the screen. We were asked by the provost's office to develop a committee to address our percept or the perceived salary compression here on campus. We have been told that once we provide this report, they will hopefully be doing something about it. So, I am going to provide you just a few results right now just to give you an idea of what things look like and then hopefully, the entire report after I get feedback from this group within the next week or two. It will be going out to everybody as a final report, so you can see myself and Farhan Chowdhury, were the co-chairs of the group. Our attempt

was to make sure that all colleges and constituency groups were represented. So, we have members from the Senate, the Graduate Council, the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Association, and the Tenure Track Faculty Association, and additionally, we tried to get at least one representative from each college in the group. As a group during our first meeting, we met probably 8 to 10 times, not exactly sure how many times but as a group, we decided, after considering several different approaches that have been used by different universities, to address this, we settle on the approach the University of Washington did and that's just because of its simplicity and it looked to us, to be a relative approach. What that approach is, is to just use the median of individual salaries within a specific program as a base and so the assistance at that level in that specific program would be the base, and then we compare that to the medium of the rank above them. Based on what you would expect with the salary increase it will move up in rank. So, for example at SIU, when you move from an assistant professor to associate professor, you get a 12% pay increase, so what we would expect to see then, is within a specific program, individuals that are expected to be paid at the same level within that program we would expect the median of the associate professors to be 12% above the median of the assistant professors. So, following that out, then the median of the full professors should be the median of the associate professors, plus their 12%, plus an additional 12% on top of that salary. So that is how we identified what a compressed salary was for the non-tenure track faculty. The increase in salary with an increase in rank is \$550 a month, so again it was just adding \$550 to the median from the assistant level and then an additional \$550 on top of that to calculate the median for the full professors. So, what we did then basically got the salaries for everybody from all the faculty, we did this originally in October and realized in February that there had been an increase in salaries, plus there had been several new faculty hired during the spring semesters, so we got this data again at the end of February, and that's actually what's caused a little bit of the delay because we had to recalculate everything with the new data. So, we calculated the means for each rank and then compared those. Now what I am going to do now is just show you the results from a couple of colleges, because they give you the extreme, and give you an idea of what the rest of the colleges look like. So, if we look at this on the y-axis, the proportion of individuals within that specific group that is considered compressed is below

the median. What we find is for the College of Agriculture and Life Science, as this is the college that I am in, when we looked and did a comparison among the programs, the only program that stood out was having a different salary than the rest of the programs was the School of Chemistry and biochemistry. So, we separated that school from the other ones for the calculations, and what we found is for the associate professors in the school of chemistry and biochemistry, 66% of the associate professors would be considered compressed. So, they were below the median of what would be expected with the 12% increase. For the associate professors in all the other colleges, it was 87%, for the full professors in chemistry and biochemistry, none of the full professors were deemed compressed at this level and for this analysis, and then for full professors and other colleges, it was right below 50% I believe 47% in that college. This pattern is typical of what we see across most of the colleges, for whatever reason, it seems like the individuals at that associate level tend to be more compressed. The individuals at the associate level and the new professors at the other level tend to be what's most compressed and our impression is that it is just because that was a time when we were going through a lot of restricted income at the University, I will put it that way, and so I think that they were being hired at a slightly lower level during that period. We are not sure what occurred there but that is our impression, anyway. If we look at the non-tenure track in that same college, we find that both for chemistry and biochemistry, and others, about 50% of the non-tenure track are considered to be compressed, for the non-tenure track full rank, a 100% but that's only one individual in that rank or this category, and for the others, it was about 88%, and I believe that is maybe 6 individuals that we are looking at there. Just to give you one other college, it is a bit more complicated, and that's why I'm bringing that up, it is the College of Business and Analytics for the tenure track in that, one of the reasons this is so complicated is, there's just a huge amount of inequality in the salary levels across the various programs. Each program has to be separated or divided separately to do the comparison. For that program, what you see is for full professor level in economics, it is about 60%, for finance and marketing, it is 100%, but again, there were two individuals. The reason I have the question marks and the N/ A up here is to remind me to tell you that one of the issues we had using this approach is that in some cases, in some specific programs, there were no assistant professors in those specific programs

to form the base salary to begin our comparison and so what we did was basically to reach out to the Deans in those cases, and got what they estimated what an assistant professor would be offered currently. For the school of business or the College of Business Analytics that worked out well, because the crediting agencies provide in an annual report what the average is for the assistant professor new hires and so what that college does is use a 70% because of where we are at cost of living, etc. So, they use 70% of what the accrediting agency recommends for that program, as what they offer their assistant salary, so they have documentation of specific assistance salary. That may not be the same as the case in all colleges, but at least in that college, we have a way to do that. So, we get that information from the Deans in cases where there is no assistant professor or assistant level rank in it, and then the ones that have N/A here are just indications that there is nobody at the professor level in business and analytics and accounting in those programs. Oh, I am sorry the first one was full professors. Now this is associate professors for that same college across the various programs there, so I am not going to go into detail, but you can see how similar to what I just showed it is the associate professors that are the ones that have the compressed salaries. If we move on to the non-tenure track for that college at the associate level, these numbers down here are 0%. I just included that little bar on there so you could see that there was somebody in that category but, they were not considered compressed. So that is what it looks like for the associate level for the non-tenure track and then at the full level for the non-tenure track, so, there is only one group that has those in them. The other part of that report is that we were asked to provide a recommendation on how we think this should be remediated, as you will see in the report, we identified three potential ways to remediate salaries. The one we chose from those three was Approach B and so basically, the idea behind that is you would increase the salaries for everyone below the median for the expected median for that rank. So, for example, if you are an associate professor, and your salary is 9% below the median expected salary for an associate professor in your program, then we would recommend increasing the salary by 9% to bring you up to the median. The weakness of this approach is that individuals currently being paid above the median salary wouldn't see a pay increase when this was enacted, but I'll just remind you that the goal of this was to address salary compression, not give everybody a raise, so

we found that to be acceptable and I'll also remind you that this is a first step for addressing salaries and that at least what we've been told by the provost's office is that after we complete this study there will be an additional study that compares salaries at SIU across peer institutes to see where we stand across peer institutes. If that study finds that we are being paid below what we would be expected compared to our peer institutes, then those individuals that are being paid above the median right now that are not, considered compressed by our definition, would see also a potential salary increase. The other benefit is that it reduces the inequality within ranks, what we found out within some programs, within some ranks, there is a tremendous amount of inequality and salary within those ranks. I realized part of that is justified because either a long time ago, there was some type of pay increase associated with performance and so the individuals got a pay increase based on performance. In some cases that has not happened for a long time. I have been here for 22 years now, and I have not seen that occur in my program yet, but I think it has occurred in some other programs at least within those 22 years. The other part of that, of course, is individuals have gone out and got other job offers and renegotiated their salaries. So, there is some good justification for why we should see a variety of individuals at the same rank in the same programs, but I think a lot of that is also due to just when they were hired. So, it was out of the control of those individuals because they were hired at a time when the University was not offering as much for those salaries and again, I think that's reflected in the large number or greater proportion of individuals at the associate level that are considered below, or what we consider compressed salaries. I also want to remind you this is just the first step, so basically what we will be doing is submitting this report to the faculty associations and the administrations and it will be up to the individuals in the faculty, association, and administration to do with this report what they wish. They could use our recommendation, they could produce their way to mediate this, or nothing will get done. At this point, we just want to emphasize that if you don't like what happens with this, it's not our fault, talk to your Faculty Association representative or your administrator but I'm hoping we're about to finish wrapping this thing up, and so we'll be able to get something done by the beginning of the next fiscal year. And again, I just also want to reiterate that this is the first step in addressing faculty salaries, at least what we have been told by the provost's office that there will be another

study conducted to compare us against peer universities, to see where our salary stands against the Peer universities. So that is all I have for you any questions?

Questions for Guest: Mike Eicholz, re: Faculty Senate's salary equity study

Lakshmanan: I have a couple of questions. Thank you for doing this, and one question I have about one of your findings was that people at the associate professor level were the ones who were most impacted by this salary compression. I was just wondering what the reasons for that could be. I know you pointed out some, but it also could not have anything to do with the fact in terms of the numbers. How many people apply for moving from the associate professor Level to the professor level? What is the relative number of professors versus associate professors? You know that it could simply also be that many people may not have applied for coming up for full professorship. So, I was wondering if that is another variable here. I know you only considered, median, and of course, you are also factoring in programs like within a college, there was one program that was of an outlier, so you excluded it or looked at it more closely but the problem, I think with that is that only the median was considered, and somebody could be in a particular position for what is not factored, and it seems to me, is the number of years they have been in there. So, if you give some weightage to that, that will certainly have an impact on your findings.

Eichholz: So, there were two questions there. The first one is that it depends on the program, but with the ones I have looked at in detail, there are typically an even number of full professors and associate professors within the programs. In general, there did not appear to be a huge discrepancy in those numbers, so I do not think that is an issue. To your second question, you are right we did not incorporate the number of years that would make the analysis much more complex, and we wanted to deal with it, the assumption is that because we use the median if there is an adequate sample size, there should be a relative even distribution within those periods. So, for example, at the associate professor level, if there are enough representative individuals in there, we used a median of all those individuals, and so we would expect, anywhere from the first year to potentially 10 or 12 years of individuals being at that level and the same for the full professors. So, because we expect that we just assume there is going to be a similar distribution of

individuals between those two rings is the assumption going into that? But you are right we did not consider the years in it, and it was just simply because it would have been too complex to try to incorporate that into the analysis and so we assumed that the full and associate-level ranks have a similar distribution in the number of years across between those.

Lakshmanan: Thank you. I just have one follow-up to that, so even if you did not consider the years, I did not get it, but you mentioned something about peer institutions. I know in the past, when there was some compression, and through the Faculty Association there were some things that were given to make things more equitable, in those cases they did consider, like within disciplines what the levels were in terms of salary; and peer institution comparison was also considered. I mean, did I understand you right when you said that this is something that would be investigated in the future, or it is just this median thing?

Eichholz: Yes, that is what we have been told. This study was specifically designed to address salary compression within our institution, simply because the inflation of salaries for new faculty is a much higher rate than the rate of increase within our university and so that leads to compression of salaries within the university. We were told there will be a second study to compare our faculty salaries against our peers as a follow-up study.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Whenever the Chancellor has spoken about this, it is as part of at least a 2-part strategy and so this is just the first one.

Allen: Mike, you mentioned the practice that the University has for encouraging faculty members to look outside the institution to justify pay raises, do you have any information regarding the number of professors that do that and then do not come back? Number 2, I would be curious to know how many professors we've lost, because I know from personal experience, I know we've lost a couple within our program, I just want to know if you were able to find anything out about that, or if you could, or if you think that would be relevant.

Eichholz: I have no idea, and that is well beyond what we are doing in this study. We are just looking at compression, what levels are at, and what we think we can do to remediate it. That is a discussion between the faculty associations and administration.

Plunkett: I did not get a chance to look at this data too much Mike, I was curious about that data because it pertains to me very much. So, I am curious if this is an out effect of not hiring at the assistant level position for 5 or 6 years or if we just hired some of this last year, and that plays a part of this, but I am curious if at least on that data, it is similar for other types of programs on campus. I am curious if the associate level was compressed so much and the full professor was not, it is interesting that the associated level gets remediated and increases that salary. Then what happens to the gap between the associate and the full professor? So, if there is a 9% increase in that associate professor's salary, then essentially, you are catching up with the full professor, as I just got my 12% recently. So, does that formula take that into account then, because that is the 12% that I got when I went to full, professor, and if you are going to remediate that associate professor up to 9% that you have taken away all that compression? I am simply confused about what I am thinking here but I just found that data odd in the first place.

Eichholz: First, what we did for our calculations again was to use the base from the assistant professor and then for the assistant professor, we took that median and added 12% from what you would expect to see at the associate professor. To calculate the full professor, we took the expected, not actual salaries of the associate professors, we took the expected associate level professors. So, we take the assistant professor's median at 12% of that to calculate the expected associate professor level, then we took the expected associate professor level, not the actual professor level, and added 12% to that. So, everything is based on that assistant, professor level and then we just build up from that, and that gets away then from having to worry about the associate level compression messing with the full percent of professor calculations. Did that make sense?

Plunkett: Sure. It is interesting for all of us, when I came here 13 years, my wife plugged in the inflation calculator, and I am making the same as I made essentially.

Eichholz: That is exactly the issue, the assistant professors coming in because of inflation, etc., going with it. They are being hired for a lot higher salary than we were, you know, 12 years ago, or 15 years ago, or whatever and our salaries have not increased with inflation like theirs have.

Plunkett: Thanks, Mike. Thanks very much for doing this.

Gingrich-Philbrook: we have time for one more question I see Liliana you have your hand up.

Lefticariu: So, my question is I think this data will benefit if the inflation will be attached to it because I think we did not get increases for many years. So, I have been at SIU for 16 years, and for many years no increase in salary has occurred, even though the inflation was increasing. So, I think if these numbers were coupled with some inflation data that would be a kind of better understanding for other people how underpaid we are.

Eichholz: Again, that goes beyond what our studies set out to do so. We are just simply addressing the compression level, and the compression is, identified as what the assistant levels are being paid as they come in right now relative to what our salaries are. I think what you are talking about is if other universities and peer institutes have been increasing in salary associated with compression, we have not been doing so here, then, that is going to show up in the second part of the study. I think what you are talking about should be addressed in step two.

Lefticariu: I would suggest that something like that should be added to the recommendation because if the inflation, for example, this year was 9%, and our salary increase was 2% or something like that.

Eichholz: We're going to be certain to include some text and to be honest with you. I can't remember if I have on the draft, I sent to you but we're going to be certain to include some text and to re-emphasizing that this should be the first step in addressing SIU know, salaries and the second step we need to emphasize in this report should be the comparison from peer universities to see where we stand with our peers.

Lefticariu: Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I would add a couple of things here. I think there is an opportunity for us through the faculty association and the administration to think about how they might add the question of inflation to what they choose to do with this information; and the other thing I would say is, that those new assistant professors who are in the calculations, and were brought in at those levels is a kind of way that inflation gets into the calculation because of the level of those offers. So, there is some of that, but I agree more of that needs to be addressed. This is a critical issue for us given that part of what we are interested in is recruitment and retention of graduate faculty as part of our move toward regaining our one, and then also questions of stability about recruiting graduate students. So, it is worth spending some time here, but I do think we need to go on. Matt, I see you have a question, so let us go ahead and take it but let us let this be the last one.

McCarroll: I was just going to briefly add not a question, but a comment, that it seems like a very long delay for the second part of the study not really a question, but suggesting that maybe that be included in the report for consideration of compressing the time delayed between that because I believe that was 2025 for the step two, right?

Eichholz: With the adjustment, the study will start as soon as this is over. But 2025 is just when any recommendations from that study will be enacted. So, hopefully, if there is going to be an additional salary increase, it will be at the beginning of the fiscal year, 2025.

McCarroll: I missed that. Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you all and thanks, Mike, I appreciate the work that the committee has done to begin this and to frame it as the beginning. So, thanks for joining us today. I appreciate it.

Eichholz: You are welcome.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Okay, I am going to make a quick addition to this report and my report. I need to forecast that we will have elections for next year's chair and vice-chair at

the next full Council meeting, so for members interested in those roles, I will be happy to talk with you about this position. If you have an interest in chairing next year, let me know, because we need to have members who are willing to be nominated at that meeting rather than attempting to do it on the floor. and for those who are interested in being chair, an additional consideration would be to think about someone you might encourage to be the Vice-chair because that person also needs to be nominated at that meeting. Last year I was not told the importance of that soon enough to be able to get a vice chair in place over the summer, and there were some consequences of that, so I am trying to forecast our need to look at that next time. So please if you are interested shoot me an email and just even interested in talking about it, okay, so that I have a sense of how many people might be willing to be nominated in that meeting. Okay.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Rachel Noszicka, from the GPSC.

Report from GPSC: Rachel Noszicka

Nozicka: Good morning, everyone. I just have a couple of things today. First, I wanted to thank everyone for all your efforts to nominate students for the system-wide SIUC distinguished service award. We had over 120 applications, so we were excited to see that. That was for the system-wide awards and GPSC is also moving into its awards season to recognize people at SIUC. We offer awards for service, teaching, creative activities, and research, and then the applications for these are due by April 12 by noon, and the links can be found on our GPSC website. The website is updated so all the application forms and information are current. But please reach out to us if you have any questions and the awards will be given out at our awards ceremony at the beginning of May. As we have been mentioning about election season, GPSC has been holding nominations for our graduate council, representative, and officer positions. We will hold elections in our meeting next week.

Lastly, the student advisory committee for the SIU system is holding a system-wide discussion of student moments today from noon to one pm over Zoom. It's open to all students, and we'll include both a larger overall presentation for the first half, and then the second half will be individual campus breakout sessions where students can ask

questions and learn more about the resources on their specific campuses, and then it will be recorded, so, people will be able to review it if they can't make it, but I can send out the flyer on our email chain so that you have it with the zoom link. That is all, thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thanks. Rachel, and congratulations on those numbers of applications, it is great news.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Next our vice chair Tomas.

Report from Council Vice-Chair: Tomas Velasco

Velasco: Good morning, everybody. I do not have anything to report. Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Okay. Thank you. Next from faculty, Senate Bethany Rader.

Report from Faculty Senate: Bethany Rader

Rader: Good morning. The Senate last met on Tuesday, March 21st and we approved the following RMEs.

First, an RME for a minor in behavior analysis and therapy second an RME to eliminate the specialization in turf management in the Bs. and horticulture and add a specialization in sustainable horticultural systems in that VS.

We also passed a resolution to create a campus-wide Ad-hoc Committee on AI to discuss AI's effect on the writing capabilities of students, as well as its potential as a new teaching tool for faculty, amongst other AI-related issues.

Finally, we approved a letter written by our Governance Committee regarding constituting constituency groups after a long discussion, at the previous meeting, questioning the necessity of such groups requiring the approval of their constitution by the Faculty Senate and we also want to ask the administration for guidance on these matters, since the SIU Board of Trustees legislation statute states that chances are responsible for the recognition of such constituent groups, so we just had some concerns about our role in

legitimacy of such groups and that's all I have to report from our last meeting. Our next meeting is this upcoming Tuesday. Let me know if you have any questions.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Any questions about that? Okay, thank you so much. Let us hear from new programs Heidi Bacon.

Report from New Programs Committee: Heidi Bacon

Bacon: Good morning. Thank you, everyone, new program has been considering a new unit of instruction for the Master of Professional Accountancy. So, the resolution for the approval of the NUI for the Master of Professional Accountancy over the past years there has been an increase in the number of students who do not have business or accounting undergraduate degrees, but who do want to make a career change into the field of accounting. So, the MPAcc degree was developed to address that need, and in doing so it will combine the foundational accounting courses with the additional specialization courses to ensure that students are not only ready to enter the accounting profession but that they will become CPA-eligible. It complements the existing program by offering this alternative to students and this is needed because the anticipated retirements in the field are huge, 75% over the next 15 years. So, the demand is high, and this does not require any additional stress on the program. Existing courses will be reworked using existing faculty and resources and so this is an opportunity to market this program, increases enrollment and the program anticipates graduating 50 to 20 students per year after 3 years and it is like other programs in the State and the St. Louis area. It will be delivered face-to-face and online as I said, using existing resources. There are no additional costs associated with it, Faculty in the School of Accountancy voted seven Yes, in favor, there was one abstention, the Dean of the College of Business and Analytics supports the NUI, and the New Programs Committee approved the NUI after discussion with faculty from the school of accountancy by a vote of four Yes and one No. So, we resolved to recommend approval of the NUI, and so we are presenting it to you with the resolution, and I will be happy to take any questions.

O'Donnell: So that was a nice summary of a long forty-written resolution. Well done, I will second, and offer to try and address any issues that anyone may have.

Lakshmanan: Yeah, I had a question. Thank you, Heidi. That was great, and I was just wondering in terms of how the votes went when they submitted this RME. Did they give any explanation why there was one who did not vote that way, or did they only provide the reasoning for why this should be approved? I was curious.

Bacon: There was no information as to why there was an abstention, but the faculty and Dean's support was in the majority.

Lakshmanan: Oh, I misunderstood! I thought there was one person who did not approve.

Bacon: No, it was an abstention.

Lakshmanan: Oh, okay.

Gingrich-Philbrook: For clarity, I think one person who voted no was on the new programs committee.

Bacon: We did have one person on the new programs committee who did vote No. There were concerns from new programs about offering undergraduate courses at the graduate level, and we were able to obtain information from Dr. Odom that students in those foundational courses would be doing extra work that is consistent with graduate-level work. We were assured of that, and that was enough to satisfy the majority of the committee.

O'Donnell: Can I add to that? Again, O'Donnell from the School of Accountancy. That is a common practice in colleges and businesses across the country regarding cross-listing, undergraduate graduate courses. We do that with a couple of other courses in accounting, and I know we do it across college and what happens is the professors then sign an additional project of some type. So, it is common in our arena of academics.

Bacon: Even in the School of Education, we do that when we are certifying teachers at the master's level, our MAT programs provide that basic certification students obtain a

master's at the same time they are getting their licensure, and we always have additional course work projects that are represented of graduate level efforts and content.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thanks. So, we have a second from ED, with the resolution coming as a motion from new programs. Are we prepared to vote?

Gingrich-Philbrook: See, I will take the silence as a yes. If your vote is yes, on this new unit of instruction, please type, Yes NUI, into the chat, and similarly, if you would like to abstain or vote No, please do so.

Motion approved (16-1-0)

Gingrich-Philbrook: Andy cannot be with us for Education policies, but I know that as part of that work, Usha and I are looking at the grievance policy and have set upon ourselves a procedure for doing that work together and so you will be hearing from us about that at the next Meeting. Let us hear from the Research Committee, Liliana.

Report from Research Committee: Liliana Lefticariu

Lefticariu: So, I have just a short announcement. The Research Committee met, and we reviewed an application for funding for instrument repair, or new instrument purchases. We received eight applications, discussed them through, and made recommendations to the VCR. VCR just announced that two of these proposals were funded, and we also made some suggestions to the process on how this can be more efficient than fair to everybody on campus. So, we are looking forward to continuing this program which is good for many people. If anybody has any questions.

Tsatsoulis: I do not have a question, but I want to thank the committee because I know that service is underappreciated, and this was an extremely important service to our faculty. So, thank you so much. Everybody.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thanks. Lisa.

Report from Program Review Committee: Lisa Brooten

Brooten: No, charge, no report.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I appreciate you on that and with that we are prepared to adjourn, although I would like to add my thanks to Andrew Youpa for helping new programs contact the business school, and to get the information to approve that new instruction.

Tsatsoulis: If I may add a couple of new items to the agenda. There are two events I want to inform you of, and hopefully, you will be able to attend. The first one is the student research and creative activities Forum. It is on the 13th of April, a Thursday. We will have between 100 and 150 of our graduate and undergraduate students presenting their work. It is in the student center so I would like to encourage everybody to do it first if you have not done so, we still need judges, because the eight best presentations and posters will be presented to the Board of Trustees during their meeting. So, it is important, and I think students appreciate the opportunity to be able to show their work and to show their work off to faculty. So, if you have not done so, I encourage you to be judges. So that's one thing, and then the other thing that I was asked to be able to share with you is today, we have "Imagine Your Genius", It is something that is being organized by several units at the University Center for Teaching Excellence, my office, the office of the Vice Chancellor for Anti-racism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and the STEM Education Research Center. It is today in the Shryock Auditorium from 5 to 8 and there is a reception after that. So, students faculty staff will join the movement of showcasing their genius, so I encourage you to come there, even if you do not spend all 3 hours, just visit, and encourage this wonderful initiative that the University is promoting. That is it. Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Well, with that, I just want to remind members that if you are interested in being a chair or vice chair next year, I would appreciate it if you would let me know via email, and I hope you have pleasant days and a good end of the semester. We will see you in a few weeks. Take care, everybody.

Adjournment