

Graduate Council

December 10, 2020

Members present: Randolph Burnside, George Boulukos, Phillip Chu, Saran Donahoo, Otis Duncan, Buffy Ellsworth, Haniotakis Themistoklis, Karen Jones, Usha Lakshmanan, Junghwa Lee, Liliana Lefticariu, Ruopu Li, Adrienne Long, Matt McCarroll, Trish McCubbin, Caleb McKinley, Grant Miller, Marc Morris, Rachel Nozicka, Julie Partridge, Kyle Plunkett, Yuhosua Ryoo, Nicholas Sanislo, Thomas Shaw, Robert Spahr

Ex-Officio: Scott Collins, Lizette Chevalier, Gary Kinsel, Meera Komarraju, Austin Lane, Stephen Shih

Guests: David Anthony, Craig Anz, Karen Baertsch, Jonathan Bean, Doug Franklin, Qinfeng Ge, Erin Hascup, Scott Ishman, Phil Jensik, Eric Lenz, Rob Lopez, Anneke Metz, H.D. Motyl, OluSegun Ojewuyi, Jennifer Smith, Kenneth Stickers, Rupak Thapa

Meeting started at 8:00 AM

Morris: Good morning. Corrections to the minutes?

Corrections were given

Morris: Motion to approve the minutes?

Moved

Seconded

Minutes approved (18-0-0)

Remarks from the Chancellor and Provost:

Lane: It's good to see everybody this morning. I want to thank everyone for their efforts this semester. I know it's been a challenging semester. We are working to make sure that students are hanging in there. For Spring, we are focused on the same modalities and increasing efficiencies. We still don't know how the vaccinations will play out on campus, either providing or distributing. We have put together 2 budget scenarios for the Governor's Office; this was requested from every university in the state. There's a scenario of the budget cut being flat, the budget being reduced by 5% (4.8 million dollars), and the budget being reduced by 10% (9.8

million dollars). We will keep you updated on this front. Enrollment is looking promising, but it's still early. This is the case with all categories, whether it's undergraduate or graduate.

Komaraju: As the Chancellor indicated, the enrollment numbers are trending in a positive direction. At the undergraduate level, we are 10% up in applicants who starting applications with us, 15.9% up in actionable applications, and 28.4% higher in admitted students. This is in comparison to this time last year, which is 36 weeks out from the start of the Fall semester. At the graduate level, the numbers are also up. I expect this number to drop a bit by Spring, because there was a glitch in our tableau data last year. Right now, it looks like we are up by 350% in graduate applications. The only area we need to work on is undergraduate transfer students. This group will be a challenge for us, as we are also witnessing a decline in enrollment with community colleges. Right now, applications in this group are down 11.9% and the admits 34.7%. On this front, Admissions is focusing on turning inquiries into prospects and prospects into applications.

Thank you to the faculty for helping us bring the semester to this point. We are requesting that all instructors submit their grades in a timely manner. December 16th at 8 AM is the deadline. Students that want to opt into the Pass/NoPass grading option will need to do so by midnight on December 16th. CTE will be offering workshops for instructors the weeks of January 4th and 11th. This is for instructors who need assistance and support with their online classes.

Lane: I want to bring up Athletics, as it pertains to the budget cuts. We have phased budget cuts for Athletics, which was running a 15-million-dollar tab, which creates a 9-million-dollar hole each year. We have a three-phase plan for doing this: reduce the Athletic budget by 3 million, reduce the budget by an additional 3 million, and reduce the budget by another 3 million yet again. Currently, we have gone from 22 to about 15 million; we are wrapping up Phase 2. We will be launching the Athletic Capital Campaign this spring; we set the goal at 30 million dollars. The overall campaign is continuing. Forever SIU is up to a 200-million-dollar fundraising goal; it was previously set at 110 million. Did we talk about the Dean's search?

Komaraju: We are in the process of finalizing ads for 2 Dean searches, for the newly-formed College of Health and Human Sciences and the College of Agriculture, Life and Physical Sciences. These are national searches. After review by the Chancellor and finalization, the ads will be posted. We want to have the new deans in place by July 1st.

Questions for the Chancellor and Provost:

McCubbin: Do we know if Spring enrollment could be low? Because, apparently, some students have said that they don't like online learning.

Komaraju: I've been tracking the retention numbers closely. Compared to last week, we have improved for this week. Last week, compared to the same time last year, had a 15% decline in

returning Freshmen. This week, however, the gap has shrunk to 10%. We are actively reaching out to every student with holds that prevent them from registering. We are also in contact with the various academic units.

Haniotakis: Do we still expect that the university, outside of Athletics, will face budget cuts?

Lane: If either the 5% or 10% budget scenario come to light, I'm afraid so. We are looking at what is in our control, which is enrollment. We want to focus on thriving instead of surviving.

Morris: Are there funds available for students trying to reduce their bursar hold enough to register?

Lane: We are trying to give away close to \$250,000 to students to help with this. We've also increased the bursar amount to allow students with up to a \$1500 bursar to register. The CARES Act is helping with this.

Komaraju: Saluki Cares is also providing support.

Remarks from the Vice Chancellor of Research:

Kinsel: We will be holding a virtual research forum on April 15th. Students will be asked to record a short oral presentation. The applications for the REACH awards are now open. We can submit through the 'students' tab on the VCR website. There is a documentary titled *Going Viral* on local channels. It covers the efforts of some of our faculty in helping with the production of Viral Transport Media over the summer. Finally, I want to encourage the faculty to be aware of the policy that requires notification of an intent to submit a proposal at least 10 business days in advance of the deadline. We are operating with limited staff at the moment, so we need to enforce this policy.

Questions for the VCR:

Lefticariu: Do you have an estimate for how long the staff shortage will last?

Kinsel: I do not.

Remarks from the Dean of the Graduate School:

Shih: Good morning. I have two items for today. The Graduate School has been preparing for the Spring fellowship competitions. We have formed a number of fellowship panels in a timely manner. Fellowship checklists have recently been sent out; contact the Assistantship and Fellowship Office if you have any questions. As a friendly reminder, the submission deadline for

the fellowship nominations will remain the same. Morris and Doctoral Fellowships are due January 15th, and PROMPT and Master's Fellowship due on the 22nd.

The second item is Tuition Assistant Awards (TAA). We have analyzed the data provided by the Budget Office for graduate assistance expenditures against a number of variables, such three-year average of graduate enrollment, and number of graduate faculty. We are going to figure out the TAA commitment in terms of dollar amounts for each college; we expect to complete the job before Winter Break.

Questions for the Dean of the Graduate School:

Donahoo: How has the tuition assistance been distributed in the past?

Shih: We do a thorough analysis of the data, based a quite a few variables. Given this, the distribution varies by year.

Donahoo: What did you see from the past that made you want this change?

Shih: I think the money has been utilized pretty well, given the report that each college sends to the Graduate School. I'll pull out data from the past 3-5 years.

Haniotakis: Do you look at the number of faculty when assigning TA's? There are departments that are low on faculty and in need of TA's. We should consider the teaching needs of the departments.

Shih: We are going to take this into consideration. Thank you for the input.

Donahoo: The tuition assistance program does not go towards students with Teaching Assistants. It goes to students who do not have any other source of funding. This is what we do in the College of Education.

Shih: This is true. Teaching isn't specified. It can be given in several forms.

Boulukos: Is this a new system?

Shih: There's no set formula. But, we want to adjust to ensure that fairness is maximized. In doing so, we look at multiple variables.

Report from Chair:

Morris: I'd like to jump right in with this month's guests.

Ellsworth: It is my pleasure to introduce Phil Jensik. Dr. Jensik earned his bachelor's degree in Biochemistry at Eastern Illinois University. He came to SIU for his Master's and PhD. We were fortunate enough to recruit him here at the Department of Physiology. He is currently studying mutations of genes that are present in Autism.

Jensik. Thank you for the invitation to speak here. My lab has been studying a new disorder that we named DEAF1 Neurodevelopmental Disorder. Mutations of the DEAF1 gene are found in Autism Spectrum Disorder and Intellectual Disability, for instance. DEAF1 makes a protein that regulates other genes that are important for brain development. I'll talk about 3 facets that our lab focuses on in regards to this gene. When have collaborations with labs, such as ones from the Netherlands and Baylor College of Medicine, who collect sequencing data from participants. They have identified DEAF1 mutations within participants who ASD or ID, and send the data to us. We look at what the mutation is doing to the protein and whether it is causing the disorder. We are able to aid in the diagnosis process by targeting the DEAF1 gene. Is it DEAF1 Neurodevelopmental Disorder or something else? We also have a mouse model in the lab. We are observing the difference in behavior and cognitive function between 3 groups of mice: 2 normal DEAF1 genes, 1 normal DEAF1 gene, and no DEAF1 gene. We set up marble-burying task. This type of behavior is typical for mice, therefore, we expect the mice with normal DEAF1 genes to bury more. We did find this to be the case. The last aspect of our research is looking at how DEAF1 affects connections between neurons. This could be an explanation for Intellectual Disabilities. In conclusion, we are taking an integrative approach in these 3 different systems and shedding a light on DEAF1 and development. For this year, DEAF1 was added to the list of genes that are associated with ASD. This is a testament to all of the research that has been done on this gene. We also now know that DEAF1 connects to a number of other genes on the list.

Ellsworth: Our next speaker is a graduate student in our department, Rupak Thapa. Rupak completed his Bachelor's degree in Biochemistry at Kathmandu University in Nepal. He then completed his Master's degree in Biotechnology in India. He is currently a doctorate student here. Today, he'll be talking about how the uterus prepares for embryotic implantation during pregnancy.

Thapa: My experiment examines long non-code RNA. In comparison to mRNA, very little is known about long non-code RNA function. I have found that long non-code RNA plays a role in decidualization. We started to work with Next GeneSiS sequencing of RNA sequencing; what we did is take estradiol, cholesterol, and some other components, for a 48-hour treatment of EPC. With this treatment, you get a stimulation of decidualization in vitro. Afterwards, the isolated RNA was used for sequencing, in order to see the differently-expressed gene. Our methods of sequencing detect only the long non-code RNA and all mRNA. Next, we did Biogenetics on half-cell and similarly-expressed RNA data from another lab. Out of 17 gene targets, 15 showed increased levels in decidualization.

Morris: Thank you both.

Report from GPSC:

McKinley: Good morning. As a reminder, we can assist with funding virtual conference fees for graduate students. Additionally, please let your students know we exist; we are always looking for new members to join. My main point that pertains to this body is that our colleague Nicholas is graduating. He will have a proxy for the first Grad Council meeting in February, but we will hold a special election to set his replacement.

Report from Vice Chair:

Shaw: I'd like to present a resolution for this meeting. At our last Executive Council meeting, we were discussing the need to expediate the various resolutions that came in. We came to the conclusion that we don't need a second reading, as far as rules go. Therefore, I'd like to present the following resolution: Whereas the Graduate Council historically required two readings of a resolution prior to voting, whereas two readings delay Graduate Council action, whereas the suspension and second-reading process is time-consuming and cumbersome, whereas the Graduate Council endeavors to follow Robert's Rules of Order, as described in the Graduate Council Operating Paper, whereas Robert's Rules of Order has no required reading prior to discussion and/or voting on a resolution, and whereas all Graduate Council resolutions are investigated and are researched by the appropriate sub-committees, and whereas the Graduate Council desires to be timely and responsive to our constituents' requests. Therefore, be it resolved and acknowledged, that the Graduate Council will no longer require a second reading for proposed resolutions, and will align our actions more with Robert's Rules of Order.

Morris: This was put forth by the EC. Do we have a motion?

Moved

Seconded

Morris: Discussion on the merit?

Boulukos: I think the reason that we have a two-reading structure is that we are a university community. Wider attention from the university is often needed for these resolutions and it's easy for word to not get out if it's passed in only one reading.

Donahoo: But, what happens is that there are a lot of resolutions that go to a second reading that don't need to. This allows us to process easy decisions. If something requires attention, we are still able to table the vote for the next meeting.

Morris: There are mechanisms, under Robert's Rules of Order, that allow us to postpone or table a vote, so I don't know where the rule of the second reading came from.

Lakshmanan: While I appreciate the intent behind this, I foresee some unexpected problems. While some may think a resolution is simple, others may find an issue that we didn't think about. I think having a two-stage process is good, because we may overlook something.

Boulukos: I would also like to add that we have the ability to suspend the rules when a resolution is truly uncontroversial. Our current system does not block us from passing something in the first reading. Under the proposed system, if there's a minority opinion in the room that happens to reflect a greater constituency, it will be easily overridden.

Burnside: I have been on Grad Council for 6 or 7 years. What I've learned is that resolutions are often vetted well and are ready to be passed on the first reading. Ones that are held over and passed on the second reading only delay the inevitable changes that units are trying to enact. I've never seen a resolution pass that caused harm where the constituents were not aware. Usually, on the controversial ones, people show up on the first reading. You cannot keep anything a secret on this campus. Slowing down progress goes against our mission to serve students' needs and focus on enrollment.

McCarroll: I have a concern on this resolution. In practice, we end up voting as a council on the resolution supporting an RME, rather than having read the RME. I wonder if there's a mechanism to disseminate information prior to the first reading.

Partridge: We could not a good reason to why we deviated from Robert's Rules in the first place. From my years on Grad Council, I can see the progression from the body hardly ever voting to pass a resolution in the first reading to, in my estimation, doing so at least once every meeting. This shows a desire for more efficiency. But, I agree that McCarroll's point is probably the primary concern.

Morris: If the concern is about getting word out to people earlier, then we can absolutely do this.

Haniotakis: Our roles are more advisory; we do not make final decisions. Even after we vote, people, such as the Provost and Chancellor, can still make comments and review the resolutions. I think we should vote on the resolutions, send the resolutions to the appropriate units for feedback, and possibly revisit the resolutions if there's feedback.

Komaraju: This is only one stop; resolutions still need to go to the IBHE. It's important to keep in mind that there is a long chain of events in decision-making within higher education.

Morris: This resolution would be making one reading the default, rather than two readings. We still have the mechanisms to delay further actions, which are stated by Robert's Rules.

McCubbin: We need two things if this is passed: materials for the meetings at least one week in advance, and the willingness to postpone votes on the first reading, if there is a need for additional information.

Morris: All affected units gets notice. Is that what you are referring to?

McCubbin: I'm also thinking about us just taking the time to ponder the resolutions. This helps when we receive materials well before meetings. There were years when the council would receive materials the day before, which was difficult.

Morris: This is, perhaps, something to put in the operating papers.

Sanislo: Would it be possible to disseminate the packets, besides the resolutions, to the members of the council, so they get additional information?

Morris: We can do that. Motion to suspend Robert's Rules?

Moved

Seconded

Robert's Rules suspended (14-4-1)

McCarroll: I would like to suggest a friendly amendment to the motion. I think we need a qualifying line that specifies that members receive materials X number of days prior to a meeting in order to vote on the first reading.

Morris: How many days do you suggest?

Lakshmanan: I think 10 days would be good. For the resolutions that are difficult.

Morris: Once again, there are mechanisms in place to postpone votes, or send the resolution back to committee.

Boulukos: I would be in favor of 5 business days. I believe this is an adequate amount of time.

McCarroll: I agree. I'll make a motion to include the specification of 5 business days.

Boulukos: I don't think we need to vote on a friendly amendment, if it's designated as such.

Morris: Ok. I am fine with a notice of 5 business days.

Adoption of the resolution on the amendment of Graduate Council conduct and procedural process passes (16-4-1)

Morris: Motion to reinstate the rules?

Moved

Seconded

Robert's Rules reinstated (21-0-0)

Report from Dean's Council:

Collins: On behalf of Dean's Council, we want to acknowledge the hard work that has been done this semester. Thank you. We are focused on Spring and Fall enrollment. Solving this is the key to our woes. I would also like to reiterate the importance of faculty submitting grades on time. Late submissions can have negative consequences for our students.

Report from Faculty Senate:

Miller: We just passed a resolution to update on admissions policy on transfer students. Instead of accepting the last attempt GPA of a course, we are now accepting the highest attempt. Additionally, we have approved RME's that concern the School of Automotive, School of Aviation, School of Media Arts, School of History & Philosophy, School of Literature, Writing & Digital Humanities, School of Mechanical & Materials Engineering, and School of Chemistry & Biomolecular Sciences.

Report from Research Committee:

Jones: Nothing to report.

Report from Program Review Committee:

Donahoo: Nothing to report.

Report from Educational Policies:

Partridge: Nothing to report.

Report from Programs Committee:

Haniotakis: We have a lot of resolutions today. The first is the second reading regarding the Meyers Institute. As a reminder, they are merely requesting space from SIU and seeking a temporary status. Eventually, they are looking for permanent status from the IBHE. There was no disagreement last time, so I think we should pass it.

Morris: It's been moved by the Programs Committee. Is there a Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any further discussion?

Resolution to approve temporary status of Meyers Institute for Interdisciplinary Research in Organic and Medicinal Chemistry passes (21-0-0)

Haniotakis: The next resolution is to recommend approval of the RME for renaming the Center for Alzheimer Disease and Related Disorders as the Center for Alzheimer Research and Treatment. They are only asking for a change in a title. I proposed voting to approve.

Morris: It's been moved by the Programs Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any further discussion?

Donahoo: There's another center with the CARE acronym. I don't know if it's a good idea to have two; students may be confused.

Hascup: I'm from the Alzheimer center. We were not aware of another center with the same acronym, however, our center has external use. Students would not be looking for us.

Chevalier: This particular one is for a center out of the Med School versus a degree program on our campus. I don't see a conflict there. They serve different populations.

McCubbin: Why isn't the acronym CART?

Hascup: Looking at trends in acronyms, we thought it was ok to use any letter in 'treatment.' There are several Alzheimer organizations that already use CART.

Morris: Let's take a vote.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME for renaming the Center for Alzheimer Disease and Related Disorders as the Center for Alzheimer Research and Treatment passes (20-0-0)

Haniotakis: Next, we have the resolution to recommend approval of the RME for creation of the School of Mechanical, Aerospace and Materials Engineering. Although we don't currently offer a degree in Aerospace, a lot of our students are going to go in. I think it will be more attractive to students. This has strong support from the faculty, and no opposition. I think this is an easy decision.

Shaw: Did you say that you put 'Aerospace' in the name, because that's where the students will go it?

Haniotakis: I think because they plan to do it, so we want to include it right off the bat.

Morris: This has been moved by the Programs Committee. Is there a Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any further discussion?

Chu: In our department, there is strong support for including 'Aerospace' in the name. A lot of students will be employed by them. Additionally, some of the faculty do research in Aerospace.

Chevalier: They are on their way in developing a specialization in Aerospace at the undergraduate level. If there's enough interest in that, it may become a stand-alone degree program.

Boulukos: What were the vote numbers on this?

Morris: Faculty votes were 10-0-2.

Morris: Let's take a vote.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME for creation of the School of Mechanical, Aerospace, and Materials Engineering passes (20-0-0)

Haniotakis: The next one is a resolution to recommend approval for elimination of the Graduate Certificate in MRI. For the last five years, courses for this program have not been given, so it is essentially inactive. There is nobody available to teach the relevant course. This resolution has strong faculty support.

Morris: The faculty vote was 6-0-0. This has been moved by the Programs Committee. Is there a Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any further discussion?

Morris: Let's take a vote.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME to abolish the certificate in MRI passes (21-0-0)

Haniotakis: The next one is a resolution to recommend approval of the RME for renaming the College of Engineering as the College of Engineering, Computing, Technology and Mathematics and add units to the new college. There was no opportunity to take separate votes for forming the college and naming the college. For this reason, there is strong opposition in some units. I would vote 'no' for the name, but I agree in the forming of this college. I believe Faculty Senate also opposed this resolution in regards to the name.

Morris: This has been moved by the Programs Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any further discussion?

Miller: The resolution was originally written to not approve the RME, because of concerns due to the name change. However, we had several representatives from the proposed schools and

college expressed that shortening the name would take out representative of some units. In the end, we ended up voting to approve the RME. Another reason that helped to change our minds was a 35-25 vote.

McCubbin: Is our resolution the same as the one for Faculty Senate?

Miller: The resolution for Faculty Senate is different. We had a special committee review different RMEs.

Morris: Did you guys approve the name?

Miller: Yes. We approved the RME that included the name change.

McCubbin: Was the 35-25 vote from Faculty Senate?

Miller: The vote was from the representative bodies. We include their votes in the resolution for context.

Lakshmanan: I think it's important for every unit to be recognized. 'College of Engineering' does not sufficiently represent the character of that college. It may be good to go for a longer label. Given that the faculty voted 35-25 in favor, I think that we should respect the college's approval and name change.

Chu: In our department, there is a split vote. I believe the best way going forward is to combine Engineering and Science altogether to form the College of Engineering and Science. Given this, I'll still respect the majority vote.

Haniotakis: The various engineering departments, which altogether make up around 500 fee-paying students, are not distinguished in name, whereas Mathematics, which has around 20 fee-paying students, is listed. This is a strange way to represent the units.

Morris: Let's vote.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME to rename the College of Engineering as the College of Engineering, Computing, Technology, and Mathematics and add units to the new college passes (16-2-3)

Haniotakis: The next is a resolution for recommend approval of the RME to rename to College of Mass Communications and Media Arts as College of Arts and Media and add units to the new college. I brought this resolution here, because it has majority faculty support.

Morris: It's been moved by the Programs Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any further discussion?

Boulukos: What was the faculty vote?

Haniotakis: School of Music voted 12-5-1, Department of Theater voted 0-8-2, Art and Design voted 14-0-0. Another department voted 9-1-0.

Lopez: This is a faculty-driven RME. The vote taken two years ago. At the time of the vote, we were not ready to go ahead with the proposal. There was opposition in the beginning, but we have switched that now.

Anz: I would like to present a friendly amendment in regards to the wording of the RME. A 'merger' goes against the notion of a newly-created college. I want it to reflect that it's a clean slate for us.

Motyl: I agree. I see this RME as all units coming together to create the College of Arts and Media.

Anz: Yes, this is much more positive.

Morris: This will be amended.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME to rename the College of Mass Communications and Media Arts as the College of Arts and Media, and to add units to the new college passes (19-0-0)

Haniotakis: The next one is a resolution to recommend approval of the RME for creating the School of History and Philosophy. There is strong support from both departments. I don't see any objections, so I propose that we vote to approve.

Morris: The faculty vote was 5-0-0 for History and 3-0-0 for Philosophy. This has been moved by the Programs Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any discussion?

Stickers: I'm the Interim Chair of Philosophy. The fourth 'whereas' in the resolution says 'whereas the reorganization is anticipated to contribute to the broader institutional goal of increasing the university's Carnegie status to R1.' I've never heard this argument before. Can someone explain it?

Morris: This is not in our resolution.

Stickers: Ok. I see now that it's in the Faculty Senate one. But, I would like to know that argument sometime.

Morris: We'll hold that over for the Faculty Senate.

Stickers: I have an informational question. What's the timeline for the implementation for the change?

Chevalier: After it passes here, it goes to the President's Office at IBHE. But, I can't predict the timeline.

Morris: Let's take a vote

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME for the School of History and Philosophy passes (18-0-0)

Haniotakis: The next one is a resolution to recommend approval of the NUI for the Masters of Biomedical Sciences. The program would reside in the College of Agricultural, Life, and Physical Sciences. It is projected to be attractive to new students. They are asking for an administrative position to head this program. It can be a gateway to Premed. Given this, I would want there to be some coordination this program and the other Premed-friendly programs. Because, if not, these types programs are all going after the same target.

Morris: It's been moved by the Programs Review Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any discussion?

Burnside: I will say that programs that offer an MS as well as prep for Medical School, like the proposed one, are not common in this region. These types of programs that do not come with extra cost are on the rise. I think this is a great program that utilizes existing structures, as well as aims to increase graduate education.

Chevalier: This program, in some ways, parallels med prep, but is distinctly different. This is a unique opportunity to provide a pathway to the training of medical professionals, and I think it was very well put together. This NUI took over a year, because of the collaboration between various offices. The final product is well-crafted, in my estimation.

Haniotakis: I support the NUI, but I still think there should be coordination among the related programs. For example, coordinating to set coursework.

Boulukos: Are there any vote totals that can be reported?

Morris: The college voted 6-0-0.

Resolution to recommend approval of the NUI for the MS in Biomedical Sciences passes (17-5-0)

Haniotakis: The next one is a resolution to recommend approval of the RME for the School of Languages and Linguistics. There is some faculty support, so that's why I brought it here. In one department, the voting is 2-0-3. The other was 6-5-1.

Morris: It's been moved by the Programs Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any discussion?

Lakshmanan: A merger between Foreign Languages and Linguistics was proposed and voted on many years ago, but, administratively, no one pulled the trigger. I think this makes sense; languages and Linguistics are housed together in many universities.

Smith: I am the Chair in the Department of Languages and Cultures. We have concerns about the merger in regards to workload. Our department has recently gone through a merger, which was a very taxing process. However, in the grand scheme of things, this proposed merger makes a lot of sense.

Baertsch: There really isn't any enthusiasm about this at all. The faculty are concerned, because, in other departments across the country, there tends to be a lack of support for all units, so, ultimately, one unit gets drowned out by other units. That may or may not be the case on this campus, but, nonetheless, this concern is present among faculty.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME for the School of Languages and Linguistics passes (16-2-1)

Haniotakis: The next one is a resolution to recommend approval of the RME for the School of Literature, Writing, and Digital Humanities. There is strong support from the faculty.

Morris: The faculty vote I have is 10-2-0. This has been moved by the Programs Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any discussion?

Boulukos: Given the realities, there is strong support. Faculty did express concern over the process of the reorganization in general. Our votes reflect the desire for the process to be over, as well as overall acceptability of the outcome.

Anthony: I'm the Chair of English. I concur that there is general frustration with the reorganization process. The department actually has 19 faculty; 7 members were absent for the vote. Some of the opposition came from the uncertainty of the Interim Chair, and the name. But, overall, I think there is enthusiasm for the new school.

Morris: Let's take a vote.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME for the School of Literature, Writing, and Digital Humanities passes (17-0-0)

Haniotakis: The next one is a resolution to recommend approval of the RME for the School of Chemical and Biomolecular Sciences. I think all 7 of the faculty voted to approve this. I see a problem with splitting smaller schools apart. In this case, Physics is not being joined with

Chemistry; both are small departments. I think the university should put a limit on how small a school can be. We also need to take into account fee-paying students.

Morris: This has been moved by the Programs Committee. Second?

Seconded

Morris: Any discussion?

Jones: What are the plans with Physics?

Ishman: There's an RME, which has been submitted, to form a School of Physics.

Jones: Was there ever consideration in Merging Physics and Chemistry?

Ishman: Yes, that was the initial intent.

Jones: What fell apart on that initiative?

Ishman: Dissention among faculty of each department. I would like to point out that the College of Engineering set a precedent in creating a school with only one department; what we're doing isn't new. I think it's unfair to prevent others from seeking this school status.

Haniotakis: We are talking about schools that start with 500 students versus schools that start with 100. Breaking down smaller units is going to be a disaster. There has to be a distinction made. From an institutional perspective, we need to consider enrollment numbers and the number of fee-paying students. Larger schools, Like Agriculture, Life and Physical, are struggling to get representation from all units, whereas a one-unit school does not have this problem. In my opinion, it's unbalanced.

Jones: There is actually a proposed RME that aims at breaking Agricultural Sciences for better representation. It would split the 400 students in half.

Haniotakis: 200 students makes sense for a school.

Plunkett: When did the number of students become the gauge?

Jones: I remember thinking that not finding Chemistry and Physics a home was going to be a problem. At that time, the thought was that they would end up merging together.

Chevalier: There is an administratively-driven proposal to merge Chemistry and Physics. The proposal that you're looking at is faculty-driven. The former isn't off the table, but it's just not advancing yet.

Haniotakis: I would advise the council to reject this proposal and approve the administratively-driven one when it's time. I think there's a big problem in allowing small departments to constitute their own schools.

Plunkett: Again, the proposal in front of us is faculty-driven. Looking at the administrative proposal from the perspective of faculty, Physics and Chemistry are heavily research-driven departments that want to retain their identity. Chemistry is a ranked department. In order for us to continue at this standard, it is important to keep our autonomy. Going forward, we are focusing on cultivating our Biochemistry program, for which students have expressed interest. There's a search to add another Biochemist to the school. There is no reason to not push this proposal through.

McCarroll: I want to bring up two points. Chemistry's enrollment is not low. We have, in the last 20 years, fluctuated between 75 and 110 undergraduate students and between 50 and 75 graduate students. The second point relates to the history of joint Chemistry and Physics departments. When there is a merger, it's because the enrollment of each independent unit is low. Additionally, you have faculty that are teaching both Physics and Chemistry. This is not the case with our departments of Physics and Chemistry. We would not want a title indicating a joint department to reflect negatively outside of SIU.

Jones: Did Faculty Senate address this?

Chevalier: They voted positively on the proposal.

Miller: Yeah, it was passed.

Boulukos: Does the Provost's Office see this as a reasonable proposal?

Chevalier: Yes. The points that Kyle Plunkett and Matt McCarroll brought up were the driving points behind the proposal. Maybe Gary Kinsel can speak to this?

Kinsel: There are many ways in deciding whether a department can stand alone. One metric is enrollment, but other considerations include credit-hour generation and research standing. I believe that all are these metrics, beyond the number of majors, should be evaluated for. If all things are considered, this proposal is reasonable.

Jones: Does the adoption of this resolution imply that we support whether proposal Physics comes up with?

Chevalier: I can't speak to this yet, but I know that their proposal was sent back for revisions. They still need to go through the approval route.

Jones: What happens if nothing moves forward? Would they stay as a department in the college?

Chevalier: At this point, they are still a department in the college. I don't want to predict an outcome, with respect to the shared governance in this process.

Lakshmanan: I think the visibility of the Chemistry should continue. In this case, there are many parameters to take into account. This decision should be independent from what Physics plans on doing.

Jones: For me, this isn't a question of whether I support Chemistry or not. From an Agriculture lense, we are about to anoint another voice in the organizational structure. We are going to have two voices, when we thought that there would be one. The implication is that identities become diluted.

Ishman: I think a lot of your concerns reflect the leadership and if they are able to guide the units within and ensure fairness. Regardless of the size of a unit, all units of the college should be treated fairly.

Morris: Let's take a vote.

Resolution to recommend approval of the RME for the School of Chemical and Biochemical Sciences passes (16-1-2)

Meeting Adjourned at 11:18 AM

