

## 2017 GRADUATE COUNCIL

### Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2017

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

**Members Present:** Sue Rimmer, Constantine Hatziaioniu, Norman Carver, Constantine Hatziaioniu, Joseph Shapiro, Ras Michael Brown, Sarah Curtis, Jonathan Howard, Wesley Calvert, Dianah McGreehan, Trish McCubbin, Kenneth Stickers, Sajal Lahiri, Johnathan Flowers, Wanli Zhao, Cinzia Padovani, Rachel Whaley, Julie Partridge, Tomas Velasco, Sheena Hart.

**Members Absent:** Paula Basler, Richard McKinnies, Cynthia Sims, Justin Simpson, Greg Rose, Richard Bradley, Howard Motyl, Susan Ford, Brad Colwell, Buffy Ellsworth.

**Proxies:** Cornie Prozelsky for Paula Basler, Jennifer Lynn Smith for Richard McKinnies, Saran Donahoo for Cynthia Sims, James McLean for Buffy Ellsworth.

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

**Dr. Velasco** started the report by requesting all the reporting members to restrict their reports to under 5 minutes.

**J Flowers** moved a motion to move the committee reports directly after the chair reports in the agenda.

**W Calvert** seconded the motion.

Graduate Council voted to approve the motion – 19 in favor.

### Consideration of minutes

The minutes of the February meeting were passed without amendments.

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes– 22 voted in favor.

The minutes of the December, 2016 meeting were passed without amendments.

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes – 20 voted in favor, 1 abstained.

### Remarks – Interim Vice-Chancellor for Research, Jim Garvey

Dr. Jim Garvey said that he would like to have questions, if any, asked to him.

**T. McCubbin** said that there were growing concerns among staff members regarding the eclipse day. She said that the classes were canceled but the university buildings were supposed to remain open and asked why was the university not being closed during that time. She also expressed concern over the fact that staff members were allowed or even encouraged to take a day off on eclipse day leading to the university being under-staffed and because there would be people roaming around in the buildings, there could be security concerns.

**Dr. Garvey** said that the university was working with the local and state police and that the police had crowd control worked out. For example, there was an emergency 911. There might be a surge of about 100,000 people. The university had talked to mobile companies and they had assured that it would be managed. AT&T would bring a mobile tower on campus and mobile companies have assured that if there was an emergency, communication would not be a problem.

**Dr. Garvey** said that because there would be students on campus, they would expect all the regular services like the library and Bursar. The Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration have worked with the cabinet on this and the general consensus was that it was up to the supervisors to decide what kind of staffing they would need to keep their offices running. The staff members would have to ask their supervisors to take a leave just like other times.

**Dr. Komarraju** explained a few things that could be done by university staff to ease the eclipse day process. Those included having a parking plan so as to leave enough parking spots empty, bringing in lunch as the Student Center might be crowded, locking computer labs etc. if one fears people just walking in. But it would also be a time to showcase the university in a good light and the staff and faculty should inform students beforehand that the eclipse day would not be a business day as usual.

**J. Flowers** asked what the institution's response was to the Trump administration's rescinding Obama administration guidance for transgender students.

**Dr. Garvey** said that the administration respected all genders and was sensitive to the issues. He also said that he would talk about this issue to the cabinet to figure out how the university could deal with this.

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

Dr. Lee started his report with Spring recruitment and gave examples of the kind of work that Graduate School has been doing. The first example was that the Graduate School staff members were going to various local and regional recruitment fairs. The second example was of the Graduate School conducting various on-campus recruitment events in the Student Center and the REC Center. As the third example, he said that he had gone to the Washington International Education Conference the previous week. He mentioned that it was very productive and informative in terms of international recruitment for the university. Dr. Lee added that the plan was to follow up by working with different embassies in Washington DC so that the university could recruit more international students by working with the different ambassadors.

As the second item, Dr. Lee reported on the 3 Minute Thesis (3MT) competition. Emi Hayashi, a Doctoral student in Physiology was selected for the first place. She is going to receive \$700 as travel expense to represent SIU at the Midwest Association of Graduate Schools' Conference in Indianapolis, IN in early April. Emi Hayashi will also receive \$500 cash award (total of \$1200). Caitlin Stallings, a Doctoral student in Physiology, Klaus Cavalhieri, received second and third place honors, respectively, receiving \$500 and \$300 cash awards each. Then Dr. Lee took the opportunity to thank Dr. Jim Garvey's office for the financial support for the outstanding graduate students. He also thanked the Graduate Council members for their time and energy. He thanked Dr. Sajal Lahiri, Dr. Greg Rose, Dr. Buffy Ellsworth, Dr. Wesley Calvert, and Grad Student Representative Sheena Hart and previous Graduate School Associate Dean Dr. David Wilson. All of these members served as judges on the 3MT committee. Dr. Lee also thanked Graduate School staff members Dr.

Ratna Sinha, John Russell, and Sandra Meacham who put in several hours to take care of the logistics involved with the event and made it a success.

Third, Dr. Lee reported on six different fellowship programs. They were:

1. The Doctoral Fellowship – there were 46 applicants nominated, with 41 qualified for the panel to review. The Graduate School awarded 16 awards, 10 alternates and 15 were denials.
2. The Morris Fellowship – there were 7 applicants nominated, with 7 qualified for the panel to review. The Graduate School offered 4 awards, 1 alternate, and 2 were denials.
3. The Master's Fellowship – there were 30 applicants nominated, with 30 qualified for the panel to review. The Graduate School offered 14 awards, 8 alternates, and 8 were denials.
4. The Graduate Dean's Fellowship – there were 6 applicants nominated, 6 qualified for the panel to review. The Graduate School offered 6 awards, .
5. The PROMPT Assistantship (PROMPT – Proactive Recruitment of Multicultural Professionals for Tomorrow) – there was 1 applicant nominated, with 1 qualified for the panel to review. The PROMPT assistantship was not offered as the applicant was also nominated for the Graduate Dean's fellowship and was awarded that.
6. There were 2 applications for the Native American scholarship but the committee was still reviewing it. The decision was supposed to be made by the following Friday.

Fourth, Dr. Lee gave an update about the graduate catalogue. Dr. Lee reported that the work with the graduate catalogue updating had been finished, and the Graduate School was working with the Associate Provost's office and was also in the middle of working on the Graduate Council election. The work involved working on ballots, updating graduate faculty status and the Graduate School was working with different departments and colleges regarding that.

Finally, Dr. Lee presented a copy of the Graduate Saluki Stories which focused on diversity, academic excellence, and internationalization. He reported that the next issue would focus on identity, loyalty, and professional success. He asked the members to encourage their current graduate students or past graduate students to send their compelling and unique stories to the Graduate School (300 words or less) with action pictures. The submissions are due by April 10.

Dr. Carver asked about his notion about all graduate students paying in-state tuition and the fact that the requirement for the high achiever could be lowered. Dr. Lee replied that it had been discussed in the council meeting. The board of trustees had approved that the in-state tuition of undergraduate students did not have to be paid no matter where they were from. In the Executive Council meeting, they had talked about considering in-state tuition for all the graduate students considering that the enrollment is down. The topic of the high achiever cut off was also discussed and a 75 percentile cut-off instead of an 80 percentile cut-off was considered.

Dr. Carver said the Provost had informed that it was not possible for the Board of Trustees at the moment to approve in-state tuition for all graduate students. But it had approved in-state tuition for high achievers and added that it was entirely up to the Graduate Council to decide what a high achiever would mean. The original proposal was 75 percentile cutoff in GRE and the Graduate Council had raised the cutoff to 80 percentile subsequently. That left out an overwhelming majority of the students and the Graduate Council could lower the cutoff to 75 or 70 percentile. He asked for feedback from the council if the members were in favor of the move. Dr. Carver gave an example that in the Computer Science department,

only about 5% of the students get in-state tuition with the 80 percentile cutoff, many more would be eligible with a 75 percentile cutoff and almost everyone would be eligible with a 70 percentile cutoff.

Dr. Velasco said that the Council would need to see the data before moving ahead. Dr. Hatziaioniu expressed concern over what the Board of Trustees allows the council to do in terms of policy change and whether lowering of cutoff would trivialize standards. Dr. Carver replied that the Council had the power to change the cutoff and the decision to do that rested with the members.

Dr. Whaley supported the idea of lowering the cutoff and Dr. Komarraju said that whereas an 80 percentile cutoff meant in-state tuition for 5% of Computer Science students, it could be zero for a different department. So, she agreed that there should be data to be looked at. Dr. Carver said that Dr. Lee could possibly gather the relevant data.

Dr. Calvert mentioned that the council had decided that the assistantship funds should be available to the departments no later than March 1 and asked Dr. Lee about the status of those funds. Dr. Lee replied that the budget is the same as the previous year and that the Graduate School was only responsible for allocating money for Teaching Assistants—i.e., Teaching Assistantship Award (TAA).

### **Report from the Council Chair – Dr. Tomas Velasco**

#### **Second Reading of Resolution in Support of Graduate School at SIUC**

Comments:

J. Flowers said that this resolution was aimed at the Non-Instructional Review Committee report generated by the Non-Instructional Review Committee and asked whether it also addressed the comments and amendments made in two separate reports by the Chancellor and the Executive Planning Committee.

Dr. Velasco replied that because the resolution was read before the report came out, it does not address the points. He added that the committee supports the resolution, in general.

Graduate Council voted in favor of the resolution – 22 voted in favor and 1 abstained from voting.

#### **Action Items:**

#### **Second Reading: Resolution in support of the Addition of a Professional Science Master's Degree Track in Wildlife Administration and Management**

Comments:

**W. Calvert** asked what were the details regarding the expenses of funding programs mentioned in an earlier version of the resolution. M. Eichholz answered that none of the costs had changed and the details of the cost were taken out at the Provost's request.

**J Flowers** stated that the original PSM stated that 2 internships would be provided to the students enrolled and asked whether that had been changed. M Eichholz replied that the MOA with the Fish and Wildlife Services (the one offering the internships) cannot be signed until the program is approved. He added that the Director of the Services was also in the External Committee and there was no concern regarding the internships as such. Dr. Lee added that SIU continues to have a PSM in Advanced Energy and Fuels Management and

part of the requirement of that were the internships. He said that, 1) the internships were important and a hundred percent of the students get internships; and 2) in any graduate program, the university encourages the faculty to get internship opportunities for the students and expressed hope that it will continue with this program too.

**J Maclean** said that original PSM called for internships to be required to graduate the program. He asked what the plan was in terms of applications if too many students were enrolled as compared to internship positions available. M Eichholz replied that the Fish and Wildlife Services had said that they would provide the PSM with 20 internships. He added that there were over 2,000 PSMs across the country and they all had the exact same requirements and the SIU program was no different. To J Maclean's follow-up question on what happens if there are 25 students enrolled, M Eichholz replied that the program is limited to 20 students only.

J Flowers said that the resolution mentions that "the PSM degree has a projected enrollment of 20 students the first year and where 30 or more is achievable with increased instructional support" and asked whether that contradicted M Eichholz's previous statement about the 20-student cap. M Eichholz replied that the student intake would be increased only if additional resources were available and the program would not take more students than the number of internships available.

Graduate Council voted in favor of the resolution – 18 voted in favor, 2 voted against.

### **Second Reading: Resolution in support of the proposed Elimination of the Urban Landscape Concentration in the College of Agriculture Science**

Graduate Council voted in favor of the resolution – 19 voted in favor.

### **Non-Instructional Program Review Report**

Dr. Velasco announced that the two co-chairs of the report: Rae Goldsmith and Judy Marshall were present in the meeting.

The co-chairs mentioned that J Flowers was also in the committee and that the committee was responsible for reviewing the 2005 and 2010 reports as well as the previous Revenue Committee report. They added that the committee had invited comments from across campus, and had taken and incorporated suggestions from people across campus. The committee was not a budget cutting committee but was there for a long-term solution in case the state budget is never restored to its previous place. The report reflected a majority of the suggestions offered.

**Dr. Lee** pointed out that Charles Ruffner, mentioned in the cover page of the report, did not attend the meeting for half a year. So, there was disengagement and lack of communication between the Graduate Council and the committee. Dr. Lee suggested that the report might have been different if a Graduate Council member was present throughout. R Goldsmith acknowledged that and replied that they had gone to the Chancellor's office for a replacement which they did not get but the representative was always kept in the email loop.

**T McCubbin** said that one of the more controversial statements was the elimination of the state funding from the budget and asked whether the committee had heard from the representatives of the broadcasting services.

**R Goldsmith** replied that all the representatives were not brought in and the bit about the state budget was still a concept. **J Marshall** added that the report contained only recommendations for the Chancellor to act upon. She added that the group that made the list had state accounts in corresponding local sources of money as well. She also acknowledged that even though the committee dealt with only non-instructional aspects, the effects would be there on instructional aspects too. She also said that the Chancellor was in the process of gathering data on state support and local money of which some had cash deficits. R Goldsmith added that some of the units have been very vocal after the report came out and assured that their voices would be heard.

**T McCubbin** clarified that she did not want the report to be sitting in Graduate Council indicative of the Graduate Council's affirmation as the representative had stopped attending the meetings. R Goldsmith said that not everything in the report was unanimous and the Graduate Council was welcome to recommend and get involved with the report.

**C Hatziadoniu** suggested that some of the points in the report should not be supported to which Dr. Velasco replied that the report was advisory only.

**W Calvert** said that recommendations 7H and 7I in the report asked people to use software that the university had already bought and asked how that improved efficiency. R Goldsmith replied that it recommended increased usage of the software (Office Calendar) because it was impossible to use unless everyone used it. So, it was focused more on efficiency rather than financial benefit.

**Dr. Velasco** concluded the discussion by saying that the report looked from both micro and macro points of view, some points were efficiency oriented and some were concerned with the big picture but the report was advisory in nature.

## **Report from Standing Committees**

### **Report from Education Standing Committee – Dr. Norm Carver**

**N Carver** said that Dean Lee had submitted proposed guidelines and RME format for Accelerated Masters programs and it was supposed to be looked at by former Associate Provost Dr. Jim Allen and Interim Provost Dr. Ford. Some of the language in the report was found to be limiting the very thing it was applied to, and so the language was changed to make it more consistent and precise.

### **First Reading: Graduate Council Resolution in Support of an Accelerated Master's Guidelines and RME Format**

Comments:

**C Hatziadoniu** asked for some clarification on the fourth "whereas" in the resolution regarding drafted guidelines. N Carver replied that an earlier version of the report had the Provost's comments and Dean Lee and Dr. Allen had just modified that. He also added that an email of the document was emailed to the committee members (which Dr. Velasco confirmed) and that the only modification he made in the document was the deletion of the term "entry".

**W Zhao** asked for the rationale behind the Accelerated Master's program. Dr. Lee replied that it would help in recruitment and be very attractive to internal students if they wanted

to do an Accelerated program, especially if they had 9 credits to be counted towards the Graduate program. Dr. Lee added that it was good for certain and not all programs. The students could plan the process and do advisement. He gave the example of Agricultural Business and mentioned that the College of Liberal Arts had approved Linguistics and Criminal Justice for the program the previous year.

**N Carver** addressed the concern regarding possible conflicts between proposed and existing programs and said that the purpose of the proposal was to make sure that future proposed programs would be consistent and that the proposal applied only to future programs and not change any existing program. He opined that the programs already approved were consistent with the guidelines.

**Dr. Lee** said that the guidelines were there to maintain academic quality and consistency across the campus.

**Research Committee Report: Sajal Lahiri**  
**Establishment of a framework for a mentoring program for Faculty**

**S Lahiri** reported that the committee was deliberating on a possible committee for the mentoring of tenured faculty, especially from minority groups and expressed hope that the Research Committee would be able to come up with a review by the next meeting.

**Program Review Committee Report: Sue Rimmer**  
**Modification of the Program Review process**

**S Rimmer** reported about the proposal to change the program review procedure reducing the external and internal reviewers. The committee met internally and with the Associate Provost's office and made some suggestions. The driving force behind those was the cost factor. She emphasized that it was a tricky situation and that the focus was to reduce the external reviewer but the committee did not mandate the number to necessarily be reduced to one. The decision was still on hold and would be revisited later in the semester.

**J Flowers** asked whether the committee had reached out to the Faculty Senate to which **S Rimmer** replied in the negative and said that once the proposal has been revised, they would reach out to the Faculty Senate.

**New Programs Committee Report – Professor McKinnies (proxy: Jennifer Lynn Smith)**

No report.

**Report from Dean's Council: Meera Komarraju**

**M Komarraju** reported from the Dean's Council and her representation of the Dean's Council to the Executive Planning and Budget Committee. The Dean's Council discussed a report from the Vice-Chancellor of Research and how much grant money the university had been getting. The amount of start-up money for Fall, '17 and Fall, '18 would be less than the previous years (less than a million). She said that some colleges require more start-up money than others, due to lab equipment requirements. The committee discussed the allocation of the resources to make the best use of the limited amount and provided inputs to the Vice-Chancellor's office.

**M Komarraju** reported that the council discussed about the importance of getting data from faculty that will help in the process of academic prioritization. She requested the Deans and

Chairs of Departments and Colleges to encourage faculty members to enter the data. She suggested giving a template if the faculty were not keen to make things easier.

**M Komarraju** reported that the Deans had a retreat on the Academic Prioritization Taskforce and two more retreats were scheduled after the Spring break. The task of the council was to look at the data provided by the Provost's office and see how the programs could be prioritized using the guidelines provided by the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council.

**M Komarraju** reported on the Executive Planning and Budget Committee for the Non-Instructional Prioritization Taskforce and said that the data were looked at. One of the moving forward ideas were to categorize the recommendations into those that can be achieved quickly and have immediate financial impact in contrast to the ones that were long term, and would require more data.

**R Whaley** asked if the Dean's Council was meeting after the Spring break to which M Komarraju replied that it depended on the data entered by the faculty. If the faculty entered the data by the end of Spring break, then the council could meet and discuss the data.

#### **Report from GPSC: Johnathan Flowers**

No report.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20.