

2017 GRADUATE COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

April 6, 2017

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:05 AM.

Members Present: Sue Rimmer, Constantine Hatziadoniu, Norman Carver, Joseph Shapiro, Ras Michael Brown, Sarah Curtis, Wesley Calvert, Dianah McGreehan, Trish McCubbin, Sajal Lahiri, Johnathan Flowers, Paula Basler, Buffy Elsworth, Cinzia Padovani, Julie Partridge, Tomas Velasco, Sheena Hart.

Members Absent: Richard McKinnies, Cynthia Sims, Wanli Zhao, Justin Simpson, Greg Rose, Jonathan Howard, Richard Bradley, Howard Motyl, Susan Ford, Brad Colwell, Kenneth Stikkers, Rachel Whaley.

Proxies: Jennifer Lynn Smith for Richard McKinnies, Saran Donahoo for Cynthia Sims, Andrew Youpa for Kenneth Stikkers, JP Reed for Rachel Whaley.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Yueh-Ting Lee, Ratna Sinha, Meera Komarraju, James Garvey.

Consideration of minutes

The minutes of the March meeting were passed without amendments.

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes– 20 voted in favor.

Remarks – Interim Vice-Chancellor for Research, Jim Garvey

Dr. Garvey started by talking about the message of the university President that came out through the university system the previous week regarding the budget shortfall. He mentioned that the university system would have to take additional budget cuts, most of which would come from the Carbondale campus. Dr. Garvey stated that the university had ran out of money in October 2016 and had been running on borrowed money. The primary reason for that was the absence of the 2017 state of Illinois budget. The university was supposed to receive a second stop gap fund for the first half of the fiscal year but that did not arrive and so, SIU and other state universities were operating without funds for the entire fiscal year. The university covered its expenses with tuition money till October and since then it has managed with money from the School of Medicine. The university President also informed that the university has to keep borrowing money from the School of Medicine (the Board of Trustees will decide on whether to borrow from Edwardsville) and also, the university is looking at a reduction of 15% from the state grant. So, that added up to a grand total of \$30 million that SIU had to cut. That meant a \$19 million definite cut to the budget and an additional \$11 million projected shortfall. Dr. Garvey reported that the Chancellor had given a little more detail as to where the cuts would be made. \$10 million would be cut through attrition. The remaining \$20 million had to be cut from other places such as academic affairs and academic programs with a pretty big assumed cut to research. But an exact idea of cuts was still about to come. Cuts regarding Undergraduate Education were also supposed to be decided upon.

Dr. Garvey reported that in the research area, all expenses had been frozen in the short term including commitment to the new faculty. But he urged everyone to convince new faculty not to panic because this was a response to the cash flow problem, same as the previous year, and the new faculty were a primary concern. Dr. Garvey also added that the university was running on fumes and his office was close to being bankrupt. The only positive was that about 36% of the overhead comes back to his office through grants and that way research could be funded. He urged for patience from everyone.

Dr. Garvey talked about the “rescue bill” of \$750 million that was supposed to help higher education, social services, etc. But the Governor of Illinois announced that the state could not afford that.

J Lynn Smith said that she had attended the meeting at the town hall and they had gotten the state to announce that they would support a stop gap. She urged everyone to make phone calls to make their voices heard. Dr. Garvey reported that a major portion of the state grant that SIU gets is actually federal flow-through money, i.e. the federal government gives it to the state and then the state distributes the money to SIU through grants like No Child Left Behind, official wildlife grants, etc. There is a matching funds component – because the state does not have a matching fund allocated in the budget, it cannot take the federal money and has to return it. So, in case the state does not spend its part of the budget, SIU would be left with the expenses incurred in the name of federal grants. He added that the enrollment numbers are also not good.

Dr. Lahiri asked whether the state budget issue was the only issue because the numbers had been going down for 10-12 years. Dr. Garvey replied that the numbers have been going down from 1992 and it was due to a combination of factors. He also added that Chancellor candidates were to be selected and urged everyone to participate in the process.

J Flowers said that the President’s announcement had had a negative impact and had hampered enrollments. Dr. Garvey said that the President’s message and the Chancellor’s clarification did not get the press that was expected and that had a negative impact. He added that in spite of general fatigue in the population, people were coming for the programs, like Aviation. But the damage was already done in the past year. He added that even though the press mentioned a \$30 million cut, it did not mention what percentage of the total budget it was, and thus, it looked like a huge amount.

Dr. Reed asked what percent was \$30 million. Dr. Lahiri and Dr. Garvey replied that the total budget was \$400 million which made it about 7.5%.

Dr. Garvey said that because SIU Carbondale has been borrowing from its sister institutions and the School of Medicine, the money had to be paid back, that would hinder growth. Commenting on where the money comes from for the School of Medicine and the sister campuses, Dr. Garvey replied that it could be a variety of resources like grants, cash flows, etc. He also mentioned that everyone should also realize that the School of Medicine and the Edwardsville campus were built because of SIU Carbondale.

J Flowers questioned that a few years ago representatives from Edwardsville and Board of Trustees made an attempt to secede from the system and asked for Dr. Garvey’s comments on that. Dr. Garvey replied that that had happened more than once and legislative action had to be taken up to Springfield for anything to happen. He hoped that at some point Edwardsville would realize that all campuses depend on each other and it would be best to keep together, especially at such politically fraught times when it was imperative to present a united front to the state.

Dr. Komarraju commented that there were two aspects to the enrollment numbers going down. First was not enough students coming in and second was an issue of retention. SIU loses about a third of its students from the first year to the second. SIU should think about that as a campus. She also said that the School of Medicine and SIUE had taken cuts two years ago when SIUC had not taken any. They had gone ahead and increased their efficiency considering the cuts. SIUC had taken one cut and was due for another.

Dr. Lahiri said that most of the retirees had not been replaced, and so, why were the cuts being made? Dr. Padovani added that MCMA has been taking cuts for two years. Dr. Komarraju replied that as an example, the GA budget had been cut by 25% the previous year but not before that. Dr. Lahiri replied that the university was taking huge cuts from the faculty salaries. Dr. Garvey commented that that was included in the \$10 million cut. Dr. Lahiri replied that it was only for a year and SIU Carbondale had been taking the cuts for faculty salary for over ten years. In comparison, the cuts SIUE had taken were not that big.

Dr. Padovani asked for clarification on whether the university would keep research money for incoming faculty to which Dr. Garvey replied that the money was mostly for existing faculty. For future faculty, the thinking had to be strategic and the discussion about that was to be had between his office and the Deans. As example, Dr. Garvey said that his office used to get about \$2.5-3 million as overhead that was reinvested back to research, but this year, the number was less than a million. As a result, the research could decline for a few years.

Report from Graduate School Dean – Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee

Dean Lee started the report by mentioning that he would have to drive to Indianapolis for the 73rd Annual Conference of the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools (MAGS) on that day and would have to leave the meeting earlier than usual.

First, with regard to admission and best practices, during the Spring break, the Graduate School had contacted those departments and graduate programs with a high number of applications with no-decision. That is, if they had not made decisions on their graduate applications or had not taken any action on those applications, the Graduate School reminded them of making decisions as early as possible. Dr. Lee mentioned that the national deadline set by the CGS (Council of Graduate Schools) for graduate students to accept assistantship offers was April 15. Sometimes students make their decisions early and sometimes programs wait for students to make decisions and then make offers to other graduate students. He hoped that most of the decisions would be made in April. Dr. Lee mentioned that this may help the Graduate School increase the applications; at least it is part of the best practices for SIU's graduate education. In the past two years, the number of no-decision applications were 700/800 and 600 respectively, and he said that he hoped that the number would be brought down to 200-300 this year.

Second, this year, the Graduate School received and approved the recipient's names of the Graduate Faculty Mentor Award of Excellence selected from most colleges. On the previous Tuesday, Dr. Tomas Velasco had presented graduate faculty mentor awards to those graduate faculty members. The awardees were:

- Dr. Ahmad Fakhoury (College of Agriculture)
- Dr. Shannon McDonald (College of Applied Science and Arts)
- Dr. Ed O'Donnell (College of Business)
- Dr. Tsuchin Philip Chu (College of Engineering)

- Dr. Jared Porter (College of Education and Human Services)
- Dr. Jonathan Bean (College of Liberal Arts)
- Dr. Novotny Lawrence (College of Mass Communication and Media Arts)

Third, Dean Lee reported that the Graduate Council election was in process and the deadline for voting was the next day (April 7, Friday) by 5PM. There were six vacancies from five colleges: Agricultural Science (1), Business (1), Education and Human Services (2), Engineering (1), and Mass Communication and Media Arts (1). He addressed the council members and said that if they were from those colleges and had not voted, then they should vote before 5PM on Friday.

Fourth, on March 30 and March 31, the Graduate School had two alternate sessions with chairs and graduate directors including some of the Graduate Council chairs and members. Approximately 35-40 chairs/directors attended those two sessions. There was a very engaging dialogue on the future of graduate education. A draft copy of the strategic dialogue related to SIU's Graduate Education was distributed to the attendees. Dean Lee mentioned that if any of the Graduate Council members were interested in a copy, he would be glad to send it to them. He also mentioned that in the meeting, notes had been taken and good suggestions had been received.

Finally, Dean Lee reported that the next issue of Graduate Saluki Stories, scheduled to come out in Summer, would focus on identity, loyalty, and professional success. Dean Lee asked the Graduate Council members to encourage their current or past graduate students to submit their successful stories to the Graduate School by mid-April.

Dr. Elsworth asked whether Dean Lee had any idea about the graduate students that the departments were trying to bring in from countries on whom the travel ban had been imposed (like Iran, Iraq, etc.) Dean Lee replied that the university was still in the middle of processing I20s. Last year at the beginning of April, the number of I20s processed was about 110. But this year that number, as checked with staff members, was just 15. Thus, it was too early to say anything. He said that he might be able to give a better idea by early May. Dean Lee also added that even if the students get their I20s, it did not mean that they would get their visa. So, there was no way to know an accurate number at that point of time. Dr. Sinha added that for the Graduate School, it was business as usual.

Report from the Council Chair – Dr. Tomas Velasco

Dr. Velasco announced that there is going to be a Graduate Faculty Meeting sponsored by the Graduate Council, Faculty Senate and the Faculty Association. All top administrators were invited. The meeting was to be held on April 13 at 3:00 pm, Illinois Room – Student Center. He added that a larger room for the meeting was also being looked at.

Dr. Velasco announced that Chancellor Candidates meeting with Graduate Council members was going to be from 10:00 am to 11:00 am, in 150/160 Student Services Building. The dates and candidates were:

- April 11: Dr. Jeff Elwell
- April 19: Dr. George Hynd
- April 25: Dr. Brad Colwell
- April 27: Dr. Carl Pinkert

Dr. Velasco added that there was going to be open forums at the Guyon Auditorium from 8:45 to 9:45 on the same dates. He added that it was important for the administration to have feedback and thus, the questionnaires should be filled up.

J Flowers asked whether there would be scripted questions at the forums or would it be open to the public. Dr. Velasco replied that the questions would be scripted and same for everyone, and so, the differences in their responses should be indicative.

T McCubbin asked whether the candidates would know the questions beforehand to which Dr. Velasco replied in the negative.

Dr. Velasco mentioned that everyone should have gotten his email with a summary from the Provost about academic prioritization. The two reports: Academic Prioritization Report and Non-Instructional Report were included in the General Faculty Meeting.

J Flowers said that when the Graduate Council Executive had discussed the memo, Provost Ford said in the Dean's Council meeting, a Dean's matrix was generated and she requested for it not to be distributed. J Flowers asked if there was a motion to disclose it. Dr. Garvey said that the Provost was not ready to share the information because it was not ready and definite. It would be shared whenever it would be ready.

Dr. Lee said that another Dean's retreat was scheduled in May and hopefully, the data would be more definite after that.

Action Items

Second Reading: Resolution in Support of an Accelerated Master's Guidelines and RME Format.

Dr. N. Carver added a friendly modification to the resolution. He said that one council member had emailed to point out a problem that section 2A mentioned that if the student was admitted to the graduate program, the time to complete was the same. The member asked that if it was an Accelerated Master's, then why was the time same. Dr. Carver said that the modification was to replace "time" with "time limit" and that would fix the ambiguity.

The council voted on the resolution. 20 voted yes. 0 abstained. 0 opposed.

The resolution was passed.

Dr. Rimmer asked for clarification on the memo circulated by Dr. Velasco, pointing out that the preliminary prioritization was to happen by May 15 and the data was not to be included. Dr. Velasco replied that there was not going to be data about creative and research activities. The chairs were going to collect qualitative and quantitative data. Quantitative data would be collected automatically through institutional research by the Provost's office. Qualitative data would come from every department. But because of the date, the data was to be entered by May 1. But the data would not be ready by May 15.

Report from Dean's Council: Meera Komarraju

Dr. Komarraju reported that one of the council meetings did not take place as the Provost was out of town, but the Dean's retreat had taken place. She reported on the IBHE grant: the Illinois Board of Higher Education contacted the university saying that there was money left from the No Child Left Behind program. It was Federal money and was supposed to be returned, and that they would like the universities to compete for it. SIUC competed with

SIUE, EIU for \$750,000 and the deadline was early March. It was to support two initiatives: to train middle and elementary school teachers to teach English as a second language and high school teachers to offer a dual credit course (course offered in the high school but credit counted towards high school or college). The proposal was put together in less than 10 days and the university got all the money. Two disciplines (English and College of Instructions) stepped forward to do English as second language training. Five other disciplines offered to do the training on dual credit courses; they were College of Agriculture and Agribusiness, Geology, Mathematics, Psychology, and History. So, if there was a high school teacher with an English Master's but wanted to teach history, they would take 18 credits at the graduate level. The department was designing those courses. The money was supposed to be spent by September 30 and thus, some courses were being offered during Summer. The high school teachers would get tuition waivers for those courses.

Another set of money was to be used by instructors to develop online graduate level courses to be used in Fall and Spring. The teachers would take some classes in Summer but continue in Fall and Spring to complete the credentials.

Dr. Garvey added that it was wonderful to watch collaboration from different academic disciplines.

M. Brown added that the 18 hour credit was the minimum level set by the HOC.

Dr. Garvey said that the university got \$3.4 million from the Department of Education for science tests. Even though this was not research, the administrative costs were coming back to SIU.

Dr. Komarraju said that the Dean's council talked about the Academy Activity Insight and how to get faculty on board. Looking at the data, they realized that some of it had to be cleaned up. It was encouraging for the Deans to look at the multi-layered data. Dr. Komarraju added that the specific targets were not received. The Vice Chancellors would receive their targets by April 10, and between April 10 and mid-May they would give their plans back to the Chancellor.

J Lynn Smith asked whether there would be a decision about NTTs before July 1. Dr. Komarraju replied that May 1 was the deadline to notify the graduate students and NTT staff with a yes, no or maybe. One way to go would be to be conservative and say no, and if funds were available later on, rehire them later.

Report from Council Vice-Chair – Dr. Julie Partridge

Dr. Partridge said that one of the jobs of the Council Vice-Chair was to put people up to represent the Graduate Council on University wide committees. She had contacted members for that in the Council and thanked everyone for being patient with her.

Dr. Partridge then reported that there were three student grievances. She again thanked everyone who worked with her on that. She said that a group was meeting that day in the afternoon to address a grievance, and she was setting another group for another grievance.

Report from the Standing Committees

Report from Research Committee – Dr. Sajal Lahiri

First Reading: Resolution on Mentoring

Dr. Carver asked why was it required that the mentor be from a different department (because he was concerned that the mentor might not be competent enough) and was it only for diversity purposes (for faculty from minority or underrepresented groups or for all). Dr. Calvert replied that it was open for everybody with special emphasis on underrepresented groups. He added that one mentor alone is incompetent to help faculty and thus, the program's idea is that a mentor would help the concerned young faculty member develop mentoring facilities and thus, get in touch with other faculty members. Dr. Carver said that it made sense and suggested that it should be made part of the resolution.

Dr. Reed asked whether the resolution was about making official a practice that already existed. He gave an example that he is a cultural sociologist and he was helped by a cultural anthropologist. Dr. Calvert replied in the affirmative. He added that some colleges have good mentoring programs and some would like to have their faculty get tenure. So, they have mentoring based on issues like diversity, expertise, etc. Dr. Reed said that it might be a good idea to have some criterion for the faculty.

Report from Educational Policies Committee

Dr. Carver said that according to the Undergraduate grading policy, if a student repeated a course, only the latest grade entered their GPA. Graduate grading policy has that all grades entered the GPA. And there was the 3.0 requirement to maintain good standing to graduate. The problem with that was that if a graduate student got a single D or F and then retook the course and got an A, they would have to take more courses just in order to get their GPA up. It was imperative to bring the Graduate policy in line with the Undergraduate policy.

First Reading: Resolution in Support of Revising the Graduate Grading Policy on Repeated Courses

S. Donahoo asked if there was any conversation with the Graduate Dean about the procedure. Dr. Carver replied that the Graduate Dean has essentially been allowing the students with bad grades to repeat a course. Some schools have the policy that a course can be repeated only if the grade is D or lower. But Dr. Carver felt that it should be left to the discretion of the Graduate Dean.

Program Review Committee Report: Sue Rimmer

No report.

New Programs Committee Report: Richard McKinnies (proxy: Jennifer Lynn Smith)

No report.

Report from GPSC: Johnathan Flowers

J. Flowers opened his report with a quote from General Ulysses S Grant in his dispatch to Washington during the Battle Spotsylvania Court House in 1864. "I propose to fight out on this line, if it takes all summer." This, he believed, characterized much of the intentions of the GPSC executive where several of those items were concerned.

J. Flowers reported that GPSC, at its previous meeting, unanimously passed a joint resolution drafted with the Undergraduate Student Government that urges the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee and the Graduate Council Educational Policies committee to meet at least once before the end of the semester in an attempt to resolve the issues preventing both sides from collaborating on a University-Wide Absence Accommodation Policy.

In addition to the resolution, GPSC voted to revise a resolution recommending, among other things, a 10% cut to administrative salaries as defined by the IBHE and including Deans of colleges and caps on GA fees. To be clear, GPSC is not asking anything of the administration and deans that it is not willing to do: GPSC itself took a 35%, cut including the salaries of the executive, at the beginning of the summer and has been operating under this 35% cut for the past two years.

Further, GPSC exhausted the last of its event funding to support the International Student Council's International Games. J. Flowers added that as he had reported consistently throughout the semester, GPSC has been using its event funding to support Graduate Student conferences, journals, and other department events. GPSC currently had \$2500 in travel funding left, which allowed it to fund 16 more students for the full amount.

Where the efforts to combat the budget impasse are concerned, GPSC continued with its legislative road-trip in an effort to remind the representatives of their responsibility to their constituencies are concerned.

That dedication to accountability is something that GPSC had extended to the university administration and student government. To this end, the GPSC had completed their investigation into the USG, with an executive summary to be read at the next executive committee meeting. Copies of the summary would be made available upon request.

Where GOSC involvement in the university's attempt to deal with the budget situation are concerned, according to Board of Trustees Policies 2.f.1 "Representatives of the concerned SIUC or SIUE constituencies shall be consulted as far as in advance as possible and continuously involved in making the decision to ask that the Board declare a condition of fiscal emergency." As the representatives of the graduate and professional students at SIU, GPSC had requested that Chancellor Colwell present his budget measures at the next GPSC meeting on April 18th, wherein GPSC will also be taking nominations for our elections to be held at a special meeting on April 25th in the hall of presidents.

Finally, GPSC executive has issued a statement concerning its refusal in the Student Trustee election. To be clear, the refusal was due to the unwillingness to compromise on matters of student authority in the election of their own trustee due to the collusion of the Undergraduate Student Government and the office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and the Chancellor.

To conclude with a paraphrase of another quotation from General Grant: no terms except an unconditional and immediate surrender can be accepted. J. Flowers said that the GPSC proposed to move immediately upon the University's works.

Dr. Velasco said that the absence accommodation policy would have to be enacted by both bodies so that the university could have one policy. Dr. Carver said he had contacted Dr. Davie on whether the resolution could be brought back. He added that the Provost said that the Chancellor could impose the policy but he wanted both bodies to approve it. Dr. Velasco said that it is open now but it had to have a more formal policy. Dr. Carver said that given GPSC will vote, the Graduate Council can vote and the Chancellor can ignore the Faculty Senate if it cannot reach a decision. What happens would be known in two weeks.

Old Business: none.

New Business: none.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45.