

2019-2020 GRADUATE COUNCIL

Thursday, March 05, 2020

Members Present: Andrew Balkansky, George Boulukos, Saran Donahoo, Haniotakis Themistoklis, Ben Hendrickson, Henry Hexmoor, Karen Jones, Usha Lakshmanan, Junghwa Lee, Ruopu Li, James MacLean, Trish McCubin, Caleb McKinley, Marc Morris, Kyle Plunkett, Thomas Shaw, Emily Vajjala, Lizette Chevalier, Gary Kinsel, Meera Komarraju, Stephen Shi

Proxies: Robert Spahr (Babcock), Justin Schoof (McCarroll), Lauran Schaefer (Sanislo)

Ex-Officio: Lizette Chevalier, Gary Kinsel, Meera Komarraju, Stephen Shi

Members Absent: William Babcock, Richard Bradley, Randolph Burnside, Phillip Chu, Liliana Leticariu, Matt McCarroll, Julie Partridge, Sophia Ran, Nicholas Sanislo, Jim Wall

Meeting called to order at 8:02 AM

Morris: Good Morning everyone. Corrections to last meeting's minutes?

No corrections were given

Morris: Motion to approve the minutes?

Seconded

Motion Approved (10-0-0)

Remarks from the Provost:

Komarraju: Good Morning, everybody. Lots of updates. One is that President Mahoney started March 1st and he will be teaching a class this fall semester. His tenure home is in the Department of Kinesiology and he will be co-teaching a course with Professor Bobbi Knapp. Also, prior to starting, He had already initiated several working groups. These are academic programs: Diversity and Inclusion, Student Success. These working groups have two cultures- one from SIUC, one from SIUE. We have faculty and staff members from each campus and I'm culturing the academic program and development. We met 10 days ago via Zoom with faculty and provost from the other faculty and President Mahoney asked us to identify our top 5 programs. The next item may seem small, but it is big to some people. In classrooms where faculty are teaching, there are tables dedicated to students with disabilities, and, recently, about 110 of those tables

have gone missing. Some of those tables have been found in faculty or department offices. Scheduling has put out a request not to remove those tables from classrooms. It puts both the instructors and students out. As you know, we had the Higher Learning Commission visit us. They have not yet given us a report but it should come in the next few weeks. What they have shared with us is the high level of engagement they saw, which was unlike any other university they've reviewed. The other point HLC observed was the commitment made to SIU at every level- from the BOT to staff. In terms of enrollment management, we are going to have a SIU day on April 24th. We thank all the faculty who have suggested hands-on activities for the high school students to participate in. We also had our first SIU Transfer Day, where we hosted about 180 people-students and their families; some students had applied on the spot that day. We also initiated a new strategy where we asked high school counselors in schools below I-64 to nominate 5 students for small scholarships, and, so far, 22 high school counselors have engaged with us. We also recently had a really good scholarship weekend for selected high school students with a 3.5 GPA. About 260 families came. We had been hosting this for several years, but the number of emails we received afterwards- regarding the excitement from students about possibly coming here- was noticeably higher. We do ask the units the follow-up with these students, as they will be admitted into many other universities and the case needs to be made again for SIU. We also recently had our open house, where around 270 people attended. More importantly, the show rate is up from previous years; over 70 percent of the people who signed up attended the open house. This shows that prospective students are interested in checking us out. On that note, I would like to share our enrollment numbers. For first-time Freshman students, we have 7474 applications, which is an increase of 19.6 percent. In terms of admitted students, we are at 5126, which is an increase of over 60 percent compared to last year at this time.

Lakshmanan: So, that means that they have been accepted or just admitted?

Komaraju: They've been admitted. Whether the students come or not is our challenge. The yield from last year was 27 percent and the national average was 30 percent. That 27 percent is actually an increase. We used to get around 22 percent, but if you go back the Fall 2010, we were at 30 percent. We are aiming to get back to that 30 percent, so every admitted student is getting a postcard by units- it could be faculty, chair, dean, or fellow students. And we are also requesting phone calls to be made; As of last week, over 650 phone calls had been made. In this regard, we are more active than other universities. We appreciate the extra work everyone has been doing in order to increase our yield. We want to yield as many students as we can out of the 5000 admitted.

Lakshmanan: Out of those 5000 students, what is the demographic in terms of where they're coming from?

Komaraju: In general, when we look at the data from the admitted students, around 80 percent come from Illinois, mostly from the northern parts of the state. We also have students from around the world and outside states.

McCubbin: What accounts for the 60 percent jump, year-on-year, when it comes to the admitted?

Komaraju: Many factors. Segment analysis to find the top five high schools in Illinois.
Postcard system

Komaraju: In terms of transfer students, new undergraduate transfer students on-campus, we have 1467 applications-an increase of 5.6 percent. We have 865 admitted students, an increase of 11.2 percent. For undergraduate transfer students off-campus, our applications are at 205, representing an increase of 6.8 percent. In terms of admission, we have 120 admissions, which is an increase of 13.2 percent. In terms of graduate students, our applications are at 1270, which represents an increase of 2.6 percent. Our admissions are at 191, represents an increase of 27.3 percent. That's an update on enrollment. In terms of other updates, we had the board of trustees meeting last month informing that the Dean of the School of Law was approved, so Camille Davidson will be joining us July 1st. The search for the Dean of Education is ongoing. 3 finalists have been identified. For the proposed College of STTEM, the Dean search is ongoing. The search committee met yesterday and are reviewing the applications. In terms of the reorganization, the IBHE has approved the College of Business and Analytics, the School of Electrical, Computer & Biomedical Engineering, and the School of Civil, Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering. The College of Health and Human Sciences was approved by Grad Council and it will be voted on this month by Faculty Senate. We are reviewing the proposal for a College of Arts & Media and in progress are proposals for the Schools of Transportation, Physical Sciences, and Mechanical, Energy & Materials Engineering, School of Cinema, Radio & TV, and School of Theater & Musical Theater. The College of Liberal Arts also received a draft proposal and, based on the feedback of the draft proposal, five further proposals were submitted to the various units and we are in discussion.

QUESTIONS FOR THE PROVOST

Shih: What are the criteria for identifying these programs?

Komaraju: The potential for growth. Whatever programs are in demand have that potential.

Shih: So, it's going to be based on the past five years of data?

Komaraju: Yes. And the potential for growth. The deans have been asked to identify those programs.

Boulukos: I have been asked about the School of Theater & Musical Theater and I don't know what the right answer is on that, regarding the proposal.

Komarraju: So, the Department of Theater sent a proposal to review for feedback. That's where we're at now.

Boulukos: Would that be a school with the Arts?

Komarraju: Yes

Hexmoor: Are you looking at projections of what programs will grow based on national and international trends?

Komarraju: Yes, and these trends are what the Deans have to go by. We only information on current programs.

McCubbin: Who is on this working group?

Komarraju: There were names that were submitted to the Chancellor's office and those names were forwarded to the President's office.

McCubbin: Is it mostly faculty?

Komarraju: Yes. Faculty, staff. Offices who have more people in the know.

McCubbin: My other question is unrelated to this. Is there a plan to present the sabbatical report to the Board of Trustee April meeting?

Komarraju: It is on my list of things to get done.

Shaw: Regarding the College of Health and Human Sciences, you mentioned that the School of Transportation seems to be a major factor. What kind of movement has been made towards resolving this?

Komarraju: We have had at least two or three meetings with each of the schools and they are trying to come to some kind of understanding.

Shaw: I know there's been a lot of talk but has there been any progression?

Komarraju: Yes, I think so.

Lakshmanan: My question pertains to both enrollment and the reorganization. I was wondering if you have any input or feedback on the vision of the admitted students in terms of the reorganized schools/programs they are going into? Are the students targeting applying to a department or a school-a smaller unit of a larger unit? Has the link been made between enrollment and the reorganization?

Komarraju: In general, when we are in a state of transition, things are not perfect, but we try to manage it as well as possible. In terms of the students, the programs themselves are not being changed and the program information is being given clearly to the students. They are still being admitted into the program, no matter what school it's in.

Lakshmanan: As a follow up, how has the reorganization impacted the composition of the faculty? Even if the program is the same, the people are different and that actually makes up the unit. In Psychology, we are losing faculty.

Hexmoor: I echo your sentiment. The integrity of the unit and the discipline should stay intact. This may be a direct or indirect consequence of the reorganization.

Komaraju: I think the timing meets the reorganization because we have more interest in interdisciplinary disciplines. This gives students more opportunities.

Morris: With Economics specially, we are seeing the synergy develop with Analytics and Finance. Now Econometrics is in house and our PhD students will benefit from this too. We need to appreciate the additional opportunities that the reorganization provides.

MacLean: Since the 13 years I have been here, Biology has been the largest major yet it's not its own department. I think you might be overestimating the home unit in respect to student interest in some cases.

Plunkett: I have a quick question. Are there immediate plans to hire a replacement for the VP of Enrollment Management?

Komaraju: We've contacted a few search firms already, so there will be an immediate national search for that position. There are four units that report to Enrollment Management and I've met with the all four directors to gauge whether they wanted an Interim or immediate replacement. Based on their input, we are looking to hire an immediate replacement.

McCubbin: I assume the answer is 'yes', but if we get a suspected or confirmed case of the Coronavirus, will the school close right away?

Komaraju: Yes, but the director of Human Health Services is very much on top of it, so we are very prepared. Resources on D2L are available for online classes if we do close, though.

MacLean: The university announced yesterday that it would not reimburse CDC level 2 countries. My wife has already bought tickets for her sabbatical in Japan and we're told there is a fee for canceling. At present, the purchasing people said you would not reimburse. Surely that can't be the case.

Komaraju: We will try to be reasonable and judge this on a case by case basis.

Boulukos: Students haven't heard from the Financial Aid office for the upcoming Fall semester. Is there a date on that?

Komaraju: The office is sending out this week. We were delayed a few days because of the housing scholarships.

Morris: Before we move on to the VCR, I just want to say, in regard to postcards, that we've been doing that in Accounting and we've had very good response. Since the phone calls are

being had, students have come to visit and they ask to meet with specific faculty. The other thing is that sending the postcard as a follow-up-3 or 4 weeks out- has ignited some conversation between students and parents. If I've met the student at an open house or on campus, I can add a personal note. I think doing this will pay off for us.

Komaraju: I want to add that we've had alumni who have reached out and want to help write postcards.

Balkansky: We've been doing the postcards too. What we've found is that students and families are coming back with the postcard that was sent to them in their hand, looking to talk to a specific person. This is anecdotal, but the postcards seem to be effective.

Komaraju: We've also had stories of students who were debating between here and another university, but once they got the postcard, made a commitment to SIU. Yes, it is anecdotal but there is some evidence that it has an effect.

REMARKS FROM THE VICE CHANCELLOR OF RESEARCH

Kinsel: I have some information that I think you may find useful. On February 12th, I was up in Chicago for the announcement by the Governor that the money for the Illinois Innovation Network and Discovery Partners Institute is being released. This is going to be beneficial to our research enterprise because we expect to get about 2.5 million from that to develop what's referred to as the IFERM Hub. The money will go towards the development of the Fermentation Sciences over in the McLafferty building and, more broadly, towards Food Science and Analytics as well. We are now waiting to hear how quickly we can begin building. Related to that, there has also been some money released by the Department of Agriculture to install what's called a Phase Zero Brewing instillation. We may have a Saluki beer by the end of the semester. I also want to mention the upcoming Research Forum. It looks like we are going to have some really good participation this year. There's going to be roughly 160 posters, up from numbers we've had in the past. There is an intent to have the forum at the Art gallery of the Student Center. Encourage your students to check it out. The judging of the posters will happen in the morning and awards ceremony will happen at 3:00. The REACH award winners will be announced after the event. This year we received 38 applications and we have sufficient funding for around 28. We've been asked to pick some top-performing undergraduate researchers for SIU Day in Springfield, where the students will present at tables and meet our local legislators. SIU day is on March 25th, which precedes the Research Forum. This means that we need another mechanism for picking which students to send. Another opportunity for undergraduate researchers is the Illinois Innovation Network Undergraduate Research Day. The date for this is May 7th, which may interfere with students' finals, so we need to pick undergraduates who don't have a final that day. There's going to be a career proposal workshop held on March 19th. If you have young faculty, assistant professors who might be interested in writing a career proposal, please let them know that there will be a workshop this month. I am on one of the meetings that the Chancellor put together called Partnerships. We got our charge from President Mahoney

about a week and a half ago and he is interested in identifying the partnerships between the various system universities and external community industries. We are in good shape for responding to this because we just did the HLC and there's a complete report on this already. Finally, the research directors of the three systems schools have an opportunity to meet with the new president to talk about research within the SIU system. We will be meeting with President Mahoney on March 24th. An agenda is being developed right now, but in this initial meeting, we just want to find out what he knows about the research among our campuses.

QUESTIONS FOR THE VICE CHANCELLOR OF RESEARCH

None

REMARKS FROM THE GRADUATE SCHOOL DEAN

Shih: Good morning. First, allow me to add additional information to what the Provost mentioned in regards to application admissions. International applicants make up 552 or 43 percent. In terms of admits, we got 68 or 35 percent of the total admitted students. I also have a few follow-ups. First, we had a new training session for professional development by the Registrar for the Spring during February. We used to have a Fall staff training but the Spring format was a little different. While the Fall is more like a typical classroom-style, this semester had a Q&A format. Attendees were asked to answer around 25 FAQs beforehand. The Registrar also offers the SLATE training. We have scheduled 8 trainings for March and 5 for April. I have another update on the Taiwan recruitment trip. We had a productive meeting with the CIE and have laid a more detailed plan. The CIE will renew some of the MOUs and also send a team to Taiwan by the end of the month. After that, we will identify which programs and universities have the best potential for partnership. The second step is to work on articulation agreements and course mappings. Last Grad Council meeting, I mentioned that I would be forming a working group for the Holistic Graduate Admissions Review and we now have that group. Our first meeting was last Monday. There were 12 members representing the various colleges. As a follow-up action, we have some long-term work in revamping the language of the Graduate Catalog, especially for the 'Admission for International Students' section.

Lakshmanan: Regarding the composition of those groups, is there any effort to form them in line with the new reorganized structure? It seems like you're clinging to the old system.

Shih: The members of the working group are not set. We always welcome anybody from different units.

Lakshmanan: But they should have some official standing like the others do. How serious are we really?

Morris: We're very serious but they have to go with what is already formed and then modify it after the reorg. I'm sure Dr. Shih would work to make sure that there's proper representation.

Shih: Yes, we will make adjustments for new members down the road.

Shih: Ok, that was the update for the HGAR working group. Finally, last month we had the 3MT competition on February 7th. We had three winners: The first-place winner was Tayler Hill, a doctoral student in Chemistry. The student in second place was Kristiana Fesser, a doctoral student in Applied Psychology and an Instructor in Kinesiology. Purab Pal, a doctoral student in Physiology was third. Tayler Hill will represent SIU at the Midwestern Association of Graduate School's regional competition in Milwaukee in April. The 3MT had 22 contestants and 4 judges. I hope that next year we can have more contestants and a bigger audience.

QUESTIONS FOR THE GRADUATE SCHOOL DEAN

Li: I have a question about the Coronavirus. What if, down the road, students can't travel here? What's the plan?

Komaraju: Are you talking about students arriving late to the program?

Li: Travel Ban.

Haniotakis: He means that students will not be able to come due to the restrictions of the Coronavirus.

Komaraju: There are two parts that come to mind in relation to the ban; whether the ban is one semester or for a longer duration. Deferment may be an option. There may be some online options but that decision is made by each program.

Li: They could be serving as a Teaching or Research Assistant.

Komaraju: But there has to be a Plan B made by the programs if a student is unable to travel here.

Lakshmanan: I want to add that many conferences are giving an option for students to present via Zoom. This is a good thing to implement, especially if there is a second-coming of a Coronavirus type.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL CHAIR

Morris: I want to update everyone on the Chancellor search. We had two days of marathon sessions; very passionate yet respectful discussions. We had really hard choices due to the quality, but that's a good thing. We've settled on 4 candidates that the committee has recommended and that list has been forwarded to the President. The names should be released soon.

Lakshmanan: Could you share who the people are? Are there any internal candidates?

Morris: At this time, I can't share any information. But, it should be forthcoming very soon.

McCubbin: Will there be a specific session for the Grad Council to meet with the Chancellor candidates?

Morris: Yes

Boulukos: For a follow-up on the Coronavirus, I think access to conference presentations is necessary for the students who would be affected by the travel ban or couldn't make it.

Lakshmanan: But it won't be live-streamed?

Morris: I don't believe that it will be.

Lakshmanan: I think it would be good to live-stream because that would energize them. It's like old news.

Morris: You mean watching the recording would be old news?

Lakshmanan: Yes. It makes sense for students to watch it when it's actually happening.

Morris: I'll move that comment forward.

Boulukos: If it's already being filmed, I'm sure it's simple to also live-stream it.

McCubbin: For a counter observation, I think the students who were actually energized would be the ones to be there in person unless sick. I don't think there's a dire call to have the presentations live-streamed.

Boulukos: In any case, having a plan in place to have them uploaded is great.

Morris: It's in place.

REPORT FROM VICE CHAIR

Nothing to report

REPORT FROM DEAN'S COUNCIL

Balkansky: The Day of Giving ended this morning at 6 AM and I think it's a record number with \$1.6 million. The deans had been working to differentiate categories to get a better response from donors. For example, we separated the Performing Arts from Liberal Arts and Marching Salukis from Performing Arts to make people more excited to give to what they're interested in. I think this approach contributed to the positive outcome. Among many reasons that I could mention, this was one that immediately came to mind.

Komaraju: Just for context, first year was over \$200,000, next year over \$300,000 and last year was over \$800,000.

Balkansky: More generally, what I'm saying is that the deans and the colleges had been working more intensively with their foundation connections over the last few years, which is why it's been successful.

REPORT FROM RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Nothing to report

REPORT FROM PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Nothing to report

REPORT FROM EDUCATIONAL POLICY

McCubbin: I'm speaking on behalf of Julie Partridge, who is off doing other things for the university. We have the second reading of the resolution on defining doctoral degree programs. We have not changed anything in the resolution, except for its name. It used to be the resolution on 'updating and defining doctoral degrees. We are doing this, because, if you recall from the last meeting, some of our Doctoral degrees are less research-focused and more clinical-focused, so we have changed the language in the Graduate Catalog to reflect this. This is the second reading, so we need a vote.

Motion to approve resolution

Seconded

Morris: Any discussion?

Boulukos: Just to be clear, the point is to separate Research and Clinical degree programs by creating new information with the adding of the clinical doctoral degree? Just wanted to make sure we have the basic recap of it.

McCubbin: Yes, that is the basic recap and the other element that I want to say is that research section of the Grad Catalog has a lot of details that we aren't changing. As for the details of the clinical, we basically referred to reader to the pertaining clinical programs.

Hendrickson: Just to clarify, will there be a practical/research distinction in the traditional research-based doctoral programs?

McCubbin: The programs are not going to change. This is simply just language for the catalog, which had been pertaining to only research-based doctoral programs before.

Motion to approve resolution: Passed (18-0-1)

REPORT FROM GPSC

McKinley: Good Morning. First, we had our recent meeting on February 25th. We covered our GPSC Research Awards. We are currently developing a committee for an Outstanding Graduate Teacher award. We also have the GPSC Distinguished and Outstanding Service award. All of this information can be found on the GPSC website. There was a resolution for the authorization of funds for the Student Activities Research Forum and nominations for candidates for GPSC

officers and Graduate Council representatives for the following year. Those elections and additional nominations will happen at our upcoming meetings.

QUESTIONS FOR GPSC

Boulukos: Has the application date for the awards already passed?

McKinley: I think the deadline to issue a nomination is in April. Once that is submitted, letters of recommendation will be collected. The committee will then meet to go over the applications and nominations.

Boulukos: Are the awards for students that have either prospective and retrospective research?

McKinley: My understanding is that the award is for research that is already done or in progress, like a dissertation.

Vajjala: I've served on the committee for the last two years and a lot of the proposals are things that students are planning on doing or needing funding to fulfill.

Boulukos: But they could also say that they went on a trip for a particular research purpose?

Vajjala: I don't see why they couldn't.

Li: Is there to be one award or several different?

Vajjala: Several. I think we awarded 5 research awards last year.

McKinley: And there were 3 for the teaching award.

REPORT FROM PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Haniotakis: We have a new resolution for rename the College of Science to the College of Agriculture, Life & Physical Science. My recommendation is positive, but I want to mention a few things. In general, there is lack of support from the involved units. Agricultural Sciences, Biological Sciences and Chemistry voted to approve the resolution. ESS, Math and Physics are the departments that oppose the resolution. The reason for the opposition, from my knowledge, is not the renaming of the college, but the fact that the units involved don't get to keep their own college. If the name is truly an issue, then I don't see why it couldn't be revised in the future. I don't see a problem with the new name but there is potential for disagreement with which department should be listed first. I invite anyone from these departments to express their objections, but, at some point, we have to move on with the reorganization plan. Departments with high enrollment will complain about not having their own college, which will stall the reorganization.

QUESTIONS FOR PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Jones: So, you propose that we move 3 schools into the renamed college?

Haniotakis: Yes, because these 3 schools are already formed schools.

Jones: There isn't clarity on if there are only 3 schools. Is there the possibility for more schools or departments to join later?

Haniotakis: The 3 schools that are already formed are Agricultural, Life Sciences, and ESS. We have a few more departments that haven't joined a school yet, so they may be included in this. As of now, Math, Physics and Chemistry haven't joined a school. We can't make a commitment that the content of the resolution will be fixed.

Komaraju: For a point of clarification, Math and Statistical Sciences have been approved by Faculty Senate and Grad Council to move to STTEM. For Physics and Chemistry, there is a proposal for them to join Physical Sciences.

Lakshmanan: Is every department becoming a school?

Haniotakis: No, but some departments are asking to become their own college. These departments have big numbers of professors but low enrollment, so I don't think we can justify their request. Though, I do realize that Agricultural may have some issues because if each department within it has its own school then the college may have units as schools that have a lot of people in it compared to units with lower enrollment.

Jones: I think those are the questions that will come up.

Haniotakis: I realize that. If the university wants to unify Chemistry or Physics with the preexisting School of Earth Sciences, then I would be fine with that.

Boulukos: I do not support the resolution for renaming considering the strong opposition you have described. What we are really voting on is whether the units should fall in line before they have reached their own agreement, which I find wrong. I don't think it's appropriate for the Grad Council to endorse a reorganization plan that leave some units stranded.

Chevalier: Right now, the School of Agricultural Sciences reports to the Provost; there are no direct units under the College of Agriculture as of now. In addition, in the College of Science, we have some departments that are looking to forming schools. There are also 2 schools that are reporting to the Provost currently: The School of Biological Science and the School of Earth Systems and Sustainability. Although I appreciate your comment, George, I don't agree with it. These units are reporting to the Provost as opposed to moving into a college structure. We are renaming Science because of the existing departments that are still undergoing that. So, it really is a way of forming a college that allows our functioning to go back to more normalcy, as opposed to a disruption. That is all the reorganization is doing.

Jones: Why do we have Interim Deans of Science and Math?

Chevalier: Because we still have those college structures. What we had to do, in terms of reorganization, was form the schools, then the colleges, not the colleges and then the schools.

Boulukos: Just a clarification, are all of these units in schools yet?

Chevalier: All except for Physics, Chemistry and Math. But, there is a proposal for Math and there is something in the works for Physics and Chemistry. I think Justin can add to this.

Schoof(proxy): Sure. I think it's important to hear from units that are directly affected by this. I also take issue by some of the things you said in your opening remarks, particularly the notion that the units voting against the resolution are opposed because they don't support reorganization or they aren't getting what they want. I know you're talking about more than just the school that I am directing (ESS), just so we're clear. I wrote a memo explaining the reasons for our opposing vote and I'll share some information from that. First of all, our faculty were largely supportive of reorganization, as we understand that we need it. Geography and Geology had talked about merging departments before the reorganization plan had even been put into place. I will also say that our school is getting along well; our programs are evolving, we are finding positive ways to interact with one another. Our vote was not based on our view on the faculty that are in the proposed college; we have great respect for them. Our opposition has to do largely with the shift away from a science-focused college. STTEM is clearly a big draw. It seemed troubling to our faculty to have SIU moving forward without a college that is identified as a science college. Even though the proposed college is Agricultural, Life & Physical Sciences, the 'science' is at the end and we think that that makes a big difference. We had a consensus last year to retain a science-related college, yet the consensus hasn't been followed up on in meetings. The proposed name on the RME that we are being asked to consider today resulting from a discussion of about 30 faculty that were in attendance. To my knowledge, that only one meeting lasting for 30 minutes was held to discuss the new name. If we would have had additional discussions that more faculty could have attended, then I think the name would be more favorable. You said in your opening comments that we can always go back to change the name but I think that is more difficult to do than making the decision now. I also think that we are having premature discussions of putting a proposed school of Physics and Chemistry into a college, when that school hasn't been formed. Finally, to an earlier point, the college names are sensitive to the order; If Science had been listed before Agriculture, then, I think that there would be more support from Science and more opposition from Agriculture.

Jones: But the College of Science and Agriculture would imply that agriculture is not a science.

Schoof(proxy): Then why don't we call it the College of Science?

Haniotakis: The problem with calling it the College of Science is that not all of the science departments would be under one college. Some departments are going with Engineering and some with Life and Physical Sciences. If you want to change the name to the College of Agricultural Science, Life Science & Physical Science, then I have no problem with that. Also, with the sensitivity of the order, at some point, you have to consider enrollment and say that maybe Agriculture should be first because of its great potential.

Schoof(proxy): I'm not suggesting that I have any issue with Agriculture. My point is that we only spent 30 discussing the new name. I think it would have been better if we were to have more dialogue on this topic.

McCubbin: We would never vote on this as it stands today, considering the strong opposition from several departments. I with George in that if it comes to a second reading and we have the same debate going on, then I'm not going to vote for it. I think we have to wait until the second reading and further movement on Physics and Math.

Morris: What would be good is to have some clarity on what those next steps are.

Komaraju: I have some clarifications on Physics and Math. Math and Physics are proposed to be in STTEM. The School of Physical Sciences is in discussion, but, so far, we have proposed that in be with Agriculture and Life Science.

McCubbin: For those of us who barely know what these terms mean, this conversation is actually really hard to follow. I think for the next time, we need a chart explaining where everyone is and what everyone's status is.

Schaefer(proxy): I have been working at Whitman College, a private Liberal Arts college in Washington, and, from an outsider's perspective, I see that SIU is suffering from an image crisis. No one knows why reorganization is occurring-it seems like reorganization for reorganization sake. The proposed names of the new colleges are not necessarily helpful for students navigating which programs to apply for. For example, the College of Science makes much more sense than having these separate, random names that are unlike any other college and it's hard to convince students to apply here when there's a reorganization that makes little sense.

MacLean: Is it an established SIU convention that the new units that have multiple disciplines be in alphabetical order?

Jones: No

Lakshmanan: In terms of categorization, the problem is that you have different levels, which can't capture everybody.

Morris: It sounds like what needs to be done is to take this back. Is it possible for the groups involved in this to meet to discuss the name, since there were only 30 minutes on this topic?

Schoof(proxy): I would certainly be willing to do that.

Morris: If that could be done, that would be great. Let's get three more comments on this topic before adjourning.

Haniotakis: I have a clarification on the reorganization. The university says we have to reduce to number of colleges in order to reduce the cost. Splitting the sciences was what was decided; some to go to Agriculture and some would go to Engineering. The issue here is not the name.

The problem is that people are trying to keep a high number of colleges, which is not compatible with what the BOT has asked the university to do. If you want to have an independent College of Science, then you need to consider the enrollment. You would be left with Geography, Geology, Physics and Chemistry. How many students would not be? 150?

Schoof(proxy): No one has proposed that.

Morris: We are going to table this until a second reading because there needs to be further discussion between the affected units. It would also be helpful for representatives of those affected units to voice their concerns next meeting. For now, let's get two more comments in.

Plunkett: I'll just say that nobody from Chemistry was able to make that meeting. Our department abstained from the vote because we wanted to keep that core group of science departments together. It might be a benefit to put forward several names and vote on the best one. We don't want the loudest voice in the room making the final decision.

Hendrickson: As a graduate student, I think we should hear input from the students. Although this may seem surface level, the name is something that students take into consideration. Maybe there could be an informal poll for graduates and undergraduates to take. I think they'll have some insights on whether certain names would sway their likelihood to apply a program.

Morris: Thank you all for your comments. We have some work to do for next meeting.

Motion to Adjourn

Seconded

Meeting adjourned at 9:47 AM

