

**2013-2014 GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**Special Meeting Minutes**  
**October 17, 2013**

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. by the Chair, Carl Flowers. Proxies were read by Graduate Dean Ford.

Members Present: Craig Anz, Randolph Burnside, Norman Carver, Ryan Ceresolo, Scott Collins, Bryan Crow, Judith Davie, Saran Donahoo, Amanda Barnard GPSC, Michael Eichholz, Carl Flowers, Susan Ford, James Garvey, Boyd Goodson, Reza Habib, Constantine Hatziaodoniu, Christopher Lant, Derek Lehman, GPSC, Eric Lenz, Grant Miller, Wanki Moon, Marc Morris, Andrew Pardieck, John Stewart GPSC, Margaret Sullivan, GPSC, Tomas Velasco, Alison Watts.

Other attendees: Faculty, Students and Grad Students from COEHS

**1. Opening Remarks – Chair Carl Flowers**

Dr. Flowers called the meeting to order and announced that the attendees would need to agree to some ground rules for the meeting. Flowers asked that those presenting to the council step outside until it is their turn to present. Those not presenting were welcome to remain in the room. After everyone has made their presentations Flowers said he would open it up for discussion at that time. The agenda has time frames for each division of the meeting, and would like to keep the times on track. Flowers asked for a motion to accept the ground rules and the agenda time frame. Dr. Patrick Dilley commented that faculty from his department notified the chair that they would like to speak and some were not listed on the agenda, and the chair said he would facilitate those that wanted to speak but would limit the amount of time per speaker. Dr. Scott Collins moved to accept the ground rules, Dr. Reza Habib seconded the motion, with no discussion the motion passed. Flowers asked that all presenters stay outside the room until called in order of the agenda.

**2. Minority Reports**

Dr. Flowers remarked that this special meeting was called to get further information and answer questions on the RME for the reorganization of COEHS. Flowers asked that any reports that were on D2L be summarized and not reread to save time. Council will have a chance to ask questions regarding any reports. Flowers asked the council if they preferred that the group come in collectively or individually, the council preferred collectively.

Each of the first 4 presenters were allowed 6 min. to report. The presenters introduced themselves.

**Dr. Dan Becque, Kinesiology** opened to the council. He remarked that he had turned in a report that did not appear to be on D2L but that the council would receive that report. Becque reported that they voted twice and they were not against the merger but are against the merger through this process – or this non-process. There has been no discussion of the process or the details of it, or of the results of the merger. This has been proposed many times during his tenure here at the university. He felt the bottom line was that there was a lack of communication within the college. The parties knew of their concerns, they had expressed them more than once and that is the major problem.

**Dr. Patrick Dilley, Ed Admin/Higher Ed** – pointed out that the reports the council received are not minority reports but were majority reports. His reports were turned in and he chose not to repeat those but wanted to point out a couple facts. 1 – The faculty in his department was not involved in conversations about the merger, they didn't even have a department chair, and dean was acting as dept. chair against the operating papers of the college. At one point in time the acting dean came to them and said that they were going to take their programs into different departments and wooed them with the promise of new carpet and fresh paint. 2 – Dilley informed the council that he was the one who filed a grievance against the first vote which in turn resulted in the second vote. In

the time between the two votes the proposed RME changed substantially. When faculty came back there had been no discussion about the new RME nor was it put forward through the college advisory committee or to academic affairs committee. The majority of the faculty voted not to merge. In large part not because anyone is opposed to the idea of reconfiguration but there is no indication in writing of how exactly this is going to take place or what might happen with students in this process. When this was brought up the response was that it would be taken care of after it's done, which seems to be the motto of this whole process.

**Dr. Lyle White, Counselor Ed** reported for the Counselor Ed Faculty. He was torn between talking about the mergers of the general sort or the specifics for Counselor Education. His report was submitted and he was going to spend less time on the detail and more talking about realignments in general. White referenced the resolution drafted by the Graduate Council and the reference to an article on Arizona State's realignment. The realignment was based on faculty interest. He was particularly interested that this article was listed as documentation for the financial savings that will be accrued long term through reorganization. The article is a very conceptual piece and is only a program evaluation and is not a projected assessment and does not give any validity on the Arizona program. He stated that this kind of grabbing at ideas to support the merger is something that we have seen throughout the course of this process. The RME notes that there was a meeting in 2012, and that meeting was a retreat where no minutes were taken and the idea was to brainstorm on merger realignment and benefits of the merger. White noted that he was present at the meeting in 2012 and the RME notes that certain things were discussed and decided and such is not the case. No minutes were taken and no minutes approved to document that the decisions were made at that meeting. Appears to White that the whole process has been around finding a solution to a problem that has been around and that realignment may or may not be the answer.

**Dr. Michael May, Special Education.** May remarked that everyone should have his majority report from his program. He wanted to point out that there are some inconsistencies between the RME and the morality of what the vote represents. There is neither a 2/3rds vote in favor nor a 50% vote in favor and there is not a simple majority in favor of this merger. May did research on what Dr. White had said previously. The aforementioned article is not in a peer related magazine and does not have any peer review process attached to it. Dr. May remarked that digging deeper into the Arizona reorganization he discovered that the institution had reorganized twice in a 6 month period because of the lack of strategic plan in place before they started. May told the council that the college advisory committee is working on a strategic plan that is neutral and is a cross between the RME and what the faculty wants. He thinks this will help to line out what they can start working toward systematically from faculty input. When you put something into place without a plan – you will lose faculty, morale goes down and the plan does not get implemented. Research shows that it needs to be from the top down; lack of communication is a problem with the turnover in top positions. If there is a plan there needs to be some type of leadership in place that knows what is going on, otherwise it fails or there is a lot of resistance. If there are not going to be any changes in faculty lines or program administration, and nothing is going away then why are we doing this and this is the question that has not been answered by the administration or the COEHS. Along with other colleagues, Dr. May is not suggesting that there should not be changes but that it should be done differently.

### **Questions and Answers to first session:**

Dr. Hatzidoniou asked the presenters what kind of affects do they see on the graduate students with the proposed RME. Dr. Dilley remarked that the students in his department are mainly grad students, masters and PhD, etc. some of his programs would be split, one PhD program would go to C&I and others would be taught by faculty who don't understand what they're studying and what they will be doing with their degrees. In the master's area, one is suspended because not enough faculty but the other one would be moved to workforce education and development. The first RME said they would work out names for new departments, second one didn't. The student transcripts say that they had classes in Higher Education would now be lost in the new code of Workforce Ed. The program would be hidden because it's not named any longer and the transcripts would not have any higher education designated classes. Students wouldn't make the cut to get a job. Dr. May added that it comes down to visibility of programs. They will be affected, merger would have to go forward first and then the name changes

would occur. Programming changes are going to have to happen and resolution says they are not. Graduate Assistantships are not following the programs. The RME says there will be further reductions other than salary expenditures that go in to the department. Money will have to be shared between some units as there is no money going with the programs. It will affect both graduate and undergraduate students. White added that students have already shared that it's difficult to find programs at this university. So a lot of those problems have been taken care of in the past and they are afraid with this merger that the college will lose ground on what's been achieved already.

M. Eichholz remarked that everyone seems to be pretty consistent that you're not against the merger but instead against the process, the lack of detail that has been provided to you on how this is going to work. But he also does hear that they are against the merger, so to him in order to make his decision, he needs to understand whether they are against the merger because they don't want to see the change in the departments or if they want the people involved in this process to provide more detail so that they have a better idea of how this merger is going to look. He would like to get a better understanding on where they really fall on the merger. May replied that for them they know that a change has to occur, but he wants the faculty to be more involved in how to make this work. After they have the data, the academic affairs committee can try to figure out how to make synergies work between faculty and across departments to make the clusters of faculty with certain specialties work together, share students and make other possibilities work.

When asked if they would be against the RME as proposed if they were provided the detail – the presenters replied that would be impossible to decide without seeing the detail. Dr. Dilley added that assuming that the information is provided it would still have to be evaluated and figure out what the impact would be before answering the question. But he commented that if they do say no to this proposal it is because there is nothing there. So they can't say good or bad without knowing. They realize something has to be done they have gone from 135 faculty to 74 in a little over 3 years. Dr. Habib remarked that he was told that the college academic affairs committee reviewed this proposal and voted unanimously in support of it and that there was a member from each unit on that committee. He was told by May that he was informed incorrectly because he was on that committee. It was put forth during a non-contractual period and there was only 3 left to make this decision and still responded with concerns on it. There was no quorum to vote on it.

R. Ceresolo asked where does the RME come from? They did not know where it originated from. R. Burnside asked about the accredited programs and if there had been any discussion on how those programs would be affected. Dilley replied that there had not been amongst the faculty. State approval would have to be sought if any programs were moved and changed, which can be a lengthy process.

### **3. Dept. Chairs / Faculty of Affected Units**

**Dr. Bill Vogler, Kinesiology** – he was asked to come in and address the RME from a prospective of opportunities. Many of the ideas were developed in response to the February 2012 Administrative Retreat and various deans were looking to the potential of reorganization. This has been an ongoing discussion for over a decade. These opportunities were discussed and shared with the faculty and the former dean and then subsequently incorporated into the RME. Why consolidate? There is a historical connection between the units, they share common interests. Significant movement around the country and the region within higher education to combine and reorganize the units into common units. There are trends and patterns within other institutions. Why a school designation? If everyone is put together there will be approx. 900 majors, 30 plus tenure-track and continuing term faculty. It would be a large unit. A School might be a better value to the units and meeting student needs than a department. Opportunities include – in you have a common unit it might energize the academic culture; it might be more attractive to recruit faculty as a larger unit; might be greater opportunities for students within a larger unit to study; a school might have better clout in terms of getting grants and resources both externally and internally; there is potential of creation of interdisciplinary programs; sharing common focus; re-establishing a Ph.D program, for example in Kinesiology, might be easier to re-establish the Ph.D program as a

larger unit; larger units would have more visibility to the whole university as a whole. Opportunities from an administration prospective – potential for allowing reductions in redundancies such as directors, office personnel, etc.

**Jon McIntyre, Chair of Curriculum and Instruction** – His department voted in favor of this twice. Dr. McIntyre and some of his colleagues are excited at the thought of a potential realignment, to be able to put all the entities together in one house – makes sense – they all have one vision, working with schools, no matter what their major. It just makes sense. Some of this is already being done within education in general. The general ed classes and special ed classes are already being combined in some instances in school classrooms. Dr. McIntyre spoke about the 70's when he first came on campus and the department was one very vibrant unit. Now there are varied and different kinds of programs which cover a very broad area of education and social work. His department respects the integrity of every single program that is there. The department as a whole does not tell our programs how to run their programs, nor would they tell any other programs that would realign with them. Historically the department has always been about collaboration. Working together is part of their DNA. That would be an advantage. No licensure and no endorsement would be threatened under this realignment, based on his experience working with the Higher Board of Education in the past and continuing today. Nobody would do anything to threaten that. McIntyre believes that the realignment would make the department better as a whole, having everyone together under the same roof would strengthen the service to the schools.

#### **Questions and Answers to second session:**

S. Donahoo remarked that one of the things that State of Illinois did in restructuring their system, the state has said that they don't want the combination and want them separate. The state said the program must be definitive and different from your teacher leadership program. McIntyre replied that there would still be a C & I Program but some of the courses would fit within other programs.

M Eichholz - asked Dr. McIntyre if Curriculum & Instruction would be a new program or department, and would have a new name but he didn't know what that would be yet – is there a reason why that level of detail cannot be provided in the proposal now – send it to the faculty – get their feedback on it, make adjustments if necessary, and then provide that level of detail in the RME and everyone will have a better understanding of what is going on. Dr. McIntyre replied that he didn't have a problem doing that and he doesn't feel that the administration should do that – he felt that the faculty should be involved in that. Eichholz said that the admin is the ones driving this and said he would feel the same way if someone said "we're restructuring your department and you get no say in what's going to happen." Seems that everyone agrees that something needs to occur, it's just the process that's taking place is what everyone is uncomfortable with. McIntyre answered that for anyone to be involved they all have to meet at the table. A couple years ago they had a discussion about who they wanted to be, what their mission is and they have not had that conversation in a long time. Faculty said they can't make a decision if others are going to come in, the others deserve to have input into who we are – because they would be part of it.

C. Lant asked McIntyre if there are any synergies or independencies in the overall restructuring plan that prevent these plans from taking place one step at a time, i.e. formation of the school and other mergers to be considered later so that it is broken up into smaller pieces over a larger span of time. McIntyre replied – the argument would be that you would be working with different pieces (piece meal) for the ultimate goal and he doesn't see that happening.

R. Burnside asked if all the C & I have sat down at the table and feel that this would benefit them. McIntyre said that most of the faculty was at a meeting in April and they discussed strengths and concerns of each department, and they have not met since April. S. Ford remarked about the piece meal – from a graduate school perspective – some of these programs are already relatively small in terms of number of faculty, and the concern is if you

peel off part of it and wait a year or two then what has been left behind may not be able to function and so there is a reason to try to find homes for everyone at the same time. Faculty has to have the functionality to serve students. McIntyre said sometimes moving forward may feel like you are tiptoe around forever and you're afraid that you get too far ahead – it's kind of tricky sometimes – it's new uncharted territory.

THE FAN IN THE ROOM KICKED ON HERE. A LOT OF THE RECORDING IS FUZZY FROM HERE ON. WILL DO THE BEST I CAN TO INTERPRET.

Dr. Habib asked what is the point of putting these groups together is there is already collaboration amongst those groups? Would you be concerned that you are chairs of a large group of unhappy faculty? Vogler answered that this is a hard question to answer because it is a hypothetical question – his faculty is a high morale faculty and they will be high morale whatever happens and they are not opposed to reorganization. There are not enough details to know how faculty would react. What would be different would be the operating papers and all the questions surrounding that – how would they operate, organize and what would the structure be like? That can't be done before the RME is proposed because then you are removing the opportunity of the faculty to get together to reflect and work together and decide how they want to do this.

Dr. Collins asked for clarification – the individual programs are going to remain the same but the departments they are housed under will change and C & I name might change but they are still going to be the same – so programs are not changing we are just trying to become more efficient – is that correct. McIntyre said that is correct for now – but in ten years things could change.

S. Donahoo commented that they said their faculty is opposed to the process and asked if they could come up with a process that is better? Vogler answered – couldn't understand his answer.

J. Stewart asked for clarification on their original presentation, Dr. Vogler, supported the resolution then he also said he needed more time – are you in support of the merger and work out the process, or you are just in support of the resolution. Dr. Vogler replied that he did not say that he was in support of any resolution – he was asked to speak on the opportunities of the merger and that's what he did. He explained that he was not opposed or for and if the faculty got together and decided something different he could be out of a job – which is a concern for him.

Dr. J. Davie asked if there would be any impact on graduate programs. McIntyre spoke to specializations. They make their own decisions to their own programs and he does not see that being impacted.

A. Pardieck asked to better understand the impact on students – when prospective employers get transcripts from students – they would not see the specializations on the transcripts after the merger. S. Ford explained that there are IBHE approved programs, they get requested and approved through a very specific procedure, this is a restructuring of how administrative units report and are funded, etc. the programs will not change – the programs are the same – the code is attached to the degree program. Graduate faculty are not assigned to a department, they are assigned to a program. Graduate programs and faculty are determined by a totally different process than what they are talking about here.

#### **4. Faculty from Affected Units**

**Dr. Rhonda Kowalchuk, Quantitative Methods, part of Special Education.** The department is undergoing a name change. To support the name change it means the three programs have their own identity. This will also insure that we have 3 doctoral degrees with 3 separate concentrations. Name change is important because the way the RME is written it is encouraging that programs will remained unchanged. New units will eventually undergo a name change to better reflect the merger of departments. One could argue that there is no real

rationale so why are we arguing this proposal if the programs will remain intact. Quantitative Methods, Counseling and Special Education currently operate individually essentially in terms of program decisions. They meet 2 times a year as a faculty unit. Reallocation of the five faculty from counseling to rehabilitation may not be standard but it seems to be a good fit with the other counseling programs already there. Special Education would appear to have a better fit with C & I, than with the counseling. Quantitative Methods really doesn't fit anywhere, it makes sense that larger units are taking in smaller units and the benefit is the sharing of resources; better recognition and visibility. Based on the RME she believes that her program would be able to operate or function under the Rehabilitation Institute exactly the same way it is operating under Ed Science specialization, or she is essentially in favor of the reorganization.

**Dr. Mark Dixon, Behavior Analysis and Therapy** – His program is one that doesn't have its name represented in the Rehab Institute. There are 4 faculty within the Rehab Institute, 4 psychologists. In the beginning they did not think the Rehab Institute would be a good fit for their program, however after 14 years he is happy to say that it has been. It has been a surprising fit there. In terms of programs coming into the Institute – they don't need to worry about losing their identity. Maybe the name will be changed to represent the additional disciplines, but the day to day operations and faculty and courses will not be impacted. Programs would not be merged, there would be no problem welcoming faculty into the department, while change is scary, it was when all of them joined, nothing to worry about. They operate independently, treated fairly.

#### **Questions and Answers to third session:**

S. Donahoo asked why merge if you already operate independently?? Dr. Dixon answered, they operate independently in terms of having the power to determine the fate of students, recruitment strategies, however, as a department the students are allowed more diverse research, never expect it to amount to anything but when least expected they can be great opportunities out of the new programs coming in, especially for collaborative efforts. He added that even though some of this is going on now – it would be more helpful to have them there in the same department for the cooperative efforts.

B. Goodson asked – what are the synergies – that combines resources like AP Staff. The only place on campus where they are already stretched too thin. Grad student activity might be impacted to fix the stretch of AP Staff. Dr. Kowalchuk replied that the faculty has taken on more responsibilities over the years. Dr. Dixon said the reality is that support staff will continue to be cut because of the financial situation we're in, regardless.

Dr. Habib remarked that he read in the minority report that it sounds like the KCREPS requirements prevent the counseling faculty from teaching and supervising counselor ed courses, so how is that going to work. Dr. Kowalchuk replied that the programs are going to be the same – the units will be the same. Dixon said they would be standalone entities.

#### **5. Graduate Students from any of the Affected Units**

**Alexander Martin, grad student, Education Administration, Higher Education** – Martin read he finds it extremely alarming that with the proposed changes that have been put forth – my department will become non-existent cheating him out of a quality education. It seems that an institution that prides itself in teaching, focused on nurturing student's success has made this initial statement. His career aspirations are to be accepted into a PhD program and when they check his transcripts and don't find Education Administration – Higher Ed – that could mean the difference between him getting accepted to the PhD program and not too mean future jobs. Future jobs and his professionalism depend on visibility of his qualifications. Visibility is the key here – employers will look for Education Administration. They will look for and evaluate his credibility and professionalism based on his experience in Higher Education – not of a separate department.

**Sara Holtzmann, student, Education Administration, Higher Ed** presented: Our education is more than

curriculum; more than workforce education, more than job creation. We have the ability here within our program to be intentional and specific in our education to rejuvenate and revive higher education structures. The program produces recognized professionals and research professionals; it forms a mutualistic partnership at our institution. What this program gives us in education, the students return to the good graces of SIU. They are the future of continuing education, faculty focus on our student issues in a department with 4 programs. In a department where my education is recognized and clear recognition and promotion of the education students desire. As a student her needs are met. The program prepares students for their future, one where they can proudly represent SIU. Higher Education name is important to professional benefits and student success. Higher Education and Education Administration programs are a focused and dedicated department.

**Andrew Polacek, Ph.D, Curriculum & Instruction, Teacher Leadership** – Polacek suggested that you can't mix two theories together. If you mix two theories together you get something new. That is the conversation that needs to happen. Everyone talks about losing identity and that might happen but something new will come out of it. It will continue, he will continue, something has to happen – bring these people to the table. He personally was not given an opportunity to come in under Education Administration, Higher Ed. He was brought in under Curriculum and Instruction because the application was not reviewed by the department. This is to say that programs here are doing what they are doing to make sure student's interests are taken into account. That's not going to go away, so as dialogue continues students need to be involved in the conversation, however something has to be done, because people like himself who are not offered into a program are going to leave. That change needs to be made sooner rather than later.

#### **Questions and Answers to fourth session:**

S. Donahoo asked how many students were actually here from the college – more than 15 were present.

A student in the room asked if the students present would get an opportunity to address the council and Dr. Flowers said at the November 7<sup>th</sup> Grad Council meeting, in the Kaskaskia Missouri Rooms.

They decided to let the student speak – she was a doctoral student from the department. Several concerns come up when talking with fellow classmates, one was the learning environment – it will be compromised because of the merger. The Counselor Education department has a nurturing environment that is conducive to learning and creating productive healthy counselors to serve the community. By implementing this, students will be affected by different staff which could hurt their learning environment. For instance – one of their fundamental classes is being taught by a Rehab Institute faculty member. The course will not be taught the same way as it should be by Counselor Ed staff. Access to Clinical Center is important. They will not have direct access to the center. Issues such as these are alarming to the students.

Dr. Flowers remarked that Counselor Ed courses can only be taught by KREP. That is not possible.

Counselor Ed student remarked that they were very shocked at first. What is the point of giving the Rehab Institute a different identity? The second point was that her professor came in to talk and told to get out while the others were talking – why was Dr. Flowers allowed to stay when he was a member of the Rehab Institute. Dr. Flowers responded that he is serving as Grad Council Chair at this meeting – not representing the Rehab Institute. S. Ford described the Graduate Council purpose for some of the visitors that did not understand the relationship to the meeting.

#### **6. Interim Chair and Interim Dean**

**Dr. Cathy Mogharreban, Acting Associate Dean, COEHS** handed out a packet to each member of the council. It was her understanding that there were some questions that evolved from the circulating RME. Most of the information will be in the packet. She has been in her current position only 9 weeks, she will do the best she

can with answering questions. She started out talking about the numbers. Chart shows the reduction in staff over the last 23 years, figures speak for themselves. She was asked to look at the trend data and depending where you get the data on campus the numbers shift. The trends stay the same. In general, in 10 years we are down 276 graduate students, 1100 undergraduate students, PhD program has been stagnant, 4 masters programs have taken dismal dives, and faculty have gone from 136 faculty to 72 – almost 50% reduction. But things are continuing as they always have, we are doing much more with much less. Since 2002 the support staff has gone from 47 to 26. The figures have been going this way for more than 20 years and don't seem to be reversing. The appeal for changing and reconstruction will result in synergy that would result in program innovation, eliminate redundancies in a more organic way. Provide additional staff to assist in all the programs. She feels that something has to happen; this has been talked about for a number of years, in her capacity she has to serve on several committees that have wonderful ideas and are excited about them.

**Dr. Todd Headrick, Interim Chair, EPSE** – His conversation was very muddled. He talked about the charts in the packets. Cost savings – short term – not much but look at long term cost savings. Take 8 units to 5 units - \$60,000 immediately and 1 faculty member. The will eliminate redundancies over 10 year period which is a cost savings. Savings after 3 years – not costs but more opportunities.

### **Questions and Answers to fifth session:**

Dr. Hatziaodoniu remarked that he expected to see Dean's here to talk about the process – Where did RME come from? – What was input? Dr. Mogharreban said she was going to be talking more from a personal perspective than from a college perspective – also said that Dean Wilson is at an IBHE meeting and could not be here for this meeting. The faculty opportunity – the way she perceived it – there have been conversations at the dean's level for many years about reorganization. Some of those conversations have gone further than others. This went to the point of a concept paper which was distributed to the faculty and the faculty was asked for their input. All of us learn differently and approach problems differently. Last academic year, last fall - was when the concept paper circulated and some of the faculty would not respond to a concept paper – they would only respond to a final product – something with more nuts and bolts. She believes that this was a point of tension throughout last year among the faculty, which is how she remembers this coming down the pipe. She believes the concept paper came from the Dean's office but she does not know.

Dr. Davie asked about the cost savings. Dr. Headrick replied that the cost savings is not a big deal; as going from 8-5 units will have a stronger infrastructure, opportunities will be greater, stronger administrative support.

A. Polachek asked about the change that isn't really going to change. If you look at the data something is clearly not working here. The reality is that what is working right now is not working, things are not working now and as a graduate student we see that faculty is down, numbers are down, with restructuring what is the detriment of not doing that.

Dr. Mogharreban replied that she started her conversation earlier right there. That what they have been doing for 20 plus years is not working. In the Early Childhood Education they have went from 6 faculty to 2 and they have been having conversations as to whether it is still viable to offer this program. If we lose interest in Ph.D programs we will jeopardize who SIU is as a research institute, that is fact. In C & I, for example, almost 30% of the standards are Special Ed related. It would serve us well and our students well if we were together. We work together now, but we borrow from each other and that is different. We don't want to change the programs but change the turf boundaries so that the conversations are more obvious and more regular. There are real possibilities for synergies.

Dr. Eichholz asked to get questions to the answers given by the interim acting dean. Dr. Habib said he will get them to Eichholz.



Dr. Dilley had two remarks – 1) the need for faculty – is this merger going to create more faculty? 2) this is about visibility. He wanted to point out that when going through this that there will not be departments that recognize certain programs – it will not be an equal playing field for faculty across departments. Dr. Dixon replied with answer.

College of Social Work attendee pointed out that the Social Work department is not listed anywhere in the packet and should be included in overall RME. Dr. Flowers replied that he understood that they are not included in the vote.

J. Stewart brought up tenure faculty for grad students and advisers – they will need to be tenure track to be able to teach Ph.D programs, ultimately down the line this will cut back on tenure faculty, doesn't that defeat the purpose of bringing in more grad students when they can't find enough advisers. Mogharreban replied that is not what they want to see happen. They don't want a reduction in faculty. She sees the opportunity for there to be departments with more faculty not less. Dr. Headrick stated that the permanent is the budget cuts that have been since 1998.

C. Hatziadoniou asked about the programs, Dr. Headrick replied that the programs would stay the same they would be reducing units. Mogharreban said that if we continue and nothing changes then we could lose programs for sure. Bryan Crow asked who wrote the resolution at the last meeting. Dr. Flowers answered he drafted the resolution and the Executive Council approved it. S. Donahoo remarked that the RME was based on research – what research?? Flowers replied the one article at the bottom of the page. Resolution can be amended. Resolution was sent around to all members of grad council before the last meeting. Habib added that new programs committee asked that the RME be sent back to the college for some clarifications. The content in the RME was not sufficient for the committee to write a Resolution. Dr. Habib returned it to Dr. Flowers because he received it from Flowers. It is within Executive Committee to make the decision.

Derek Lehman asked about visibility, and the name changes, and that seems to be one of the specific issues, why wasn't that built into the RME? C. Mogharreban said it was her understanding that in order to do a name change for any department that comes from the department that reorganizes not from outside. This is for the group to decide what they want to be called and who they want to be. Lehman asked is there no way to address the issue of visibility until after the reorganization is done. Mogharreban said that if the programs are not going to change, and they will all be under the same umbrella.

R. Stocking remarked about there being a little confusion. The decision to proceed with this based on the RME and its framework was a decision made by administration. Correct. Then you add in name changes and all that and it further complicates the RME process. Article 9 says that the actual process should proceed unit by unit, we spoke before about that being one of the problems of doing a college wide RME, that generates a huge undertaking about what is supposed to be in the plan, etc. She thinks that people want to see about proceeding in a different way – then one alternative would be to doing a college wide proposal or there could be a way to scale it back and separate it from the RME process. Finally, as far as the whole issue, again that this is attached to the faculty doesn't want to discuss the plan until there is a plan, this would be a place to look at this and be beneficial to the plan. Maybe should consider changing and improving if separated RME from moving forward per Article 9.

A. Watts remarked she understands the costs of the RME but hard for her to understand the benefits of the RME? Dr. Mogharreban replied that when you look at the numbers and the direction we are moving – it is currently not working. The way she views the reorganization from a personal point of view – it made sense to her at least the ones that impact her department. Dr. May added that the visibility issue has to be put to IBHE for approval, and if you sent it forward and they don't approve it then you have merged programs together that are like putting the cart before the horse and it is a negative impact on the proposal. He thinks there needs to be a plan in place on how this proposal moves forward and allow it to be approved.

Derek Lehman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Dr. Davie seconded. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.