

Graduate Council 2021-2022

May 5, 2022

Members present: Jeremy Allen, Iraklis Anagnostopoulos, Heidi Bacon, George Boulukos, Lisa Brooten, Randy Burnside, Phillip Chu, Scott Collins, Jason Dallas, Buffy Ellsworth, Craig Gingrich-Philbrook, Usha Lakshmanan, Junghwa Lee, Liliana Lefticariu, Ruopu Li, Adrienne Long, Matt McCarroll, Caleb McKinley-Portee, Rachel Nozicka, Ed O'Donnell, Mark Pease, Sophia Ran, Zvi Rosen, Thomas Shaw, Tomas Velasco, Avian Wilkins

Executive-Officio: Lizette Chevalier, Gary Kinsel, Meera Komarraju, Austin Lane, Stephen Shih

Guests: Ahmed Al-Asfour, Deborah Bruns, Saran Donahoo, Julie Lindsey, Marcus Odom, Justin Schoof

Meeting started at 8:00 AM

Shaw: Consideration of the April meeting minutes?

Shaw: Hearing none, do I have a motion to accept the meeting minutes?

O'Donnell: Moved.

Philbrook: Seconded.

Minutes approved (14-0-1)

Remarks from the Chancellor: Austin Lane

Lane:

- **Commencement and Action Moving Forward** - My comments are more of a thank you comment and they will be brief. It's been a long year. As you know, we've got our capstone this Saturday at commencement with over 1800 students that are going to receive their degrees. That is a high number. While it is good to see all those soon to be alumni out there, that means we have to yield a lot of students on the front end. We've got to recruit a new batch of students. That seems to be going well right now. I will say that with caution. It is still 16 weeks or so out before classes start. The recruitment coordinators, advisors, faculty, staff and everyone else is working hard to increase enrollment. Our applications are up and that is a really good sign. They are actually way up. Our admits are up as well. We are seeing a double digit increase from students in the southern Illinois region. We did commit to recruiting locally here at home. We are starting to see those efforts pay off. A lot of our saluki takeovers in St. Louis and Chicago seem to be paying off as well. Again, we have to yield to those students and make sure that they want to be here.

- **National Commitment Day** - Over the last few days we've had the national commitment day that was May 1st. It really gave students an opportunity to not tell us they're going to be here but commit to being here. That means registration, housing, and all of those things that tell us they are clearly coming to SIU Carbondale. The other day I was out at Marion high school and I walked into Marion to see our students on commitment day and the first thing the principal told me was that he can't remember the last time we had this many students from Marion signed up to go to SIU. That was very refreshing to hear and see. We got a couple photos that we've been sending around as well. We're really excited about that.
- **Budget** - On the budgetary front, I just like to end the year with telling you where we are with that. As you know, we've got a lot of positive activity from the governor and the state of appropriations. It looks like in the fiscal year 2022 we're going to receive about \$3.8 million. That's a really good sign. We have to spend it by the end of this fiscal year. As you know, we already have plans to do that. A large portion of that will go to the area of covering the GiveBack. The GiveBack is based on money that we essentially borrowed from resources and reserves a couple of years back which depleted the reserve. We have to do our part and give that back. We only have about two years or so left of giving that money back. I think if you want a number there it's about \$5.4 million. We have to pay our debts off there and make sure that we have some plans to do something else with that money in the future. The fiscal year of 2023 will also receive another \$3.8 million for our state appropriation and that is again a very good number. We're targeting a percentage of those dollars to a 2% across-the-board increase for employees to really try to get to where we want to be in terms of salary. There's going to be some work there but it has to be approved by the board.
- **Job Positions** - We have a couple of other things that are going on in terms of positions. We don't have everything figured out just yet so I don't want to release anything just yet. There are some key positions, including the Vice Chancellor for research and dean of the graduate school, that we are hiring for that you will hear about within the next week. We will send out an announcement. Meera is working through a few dean positions that are going to be announced here shortly as well. We are still in negotiation phases with those. We are feeling pretty good in terms of where we are with these positions.
- **Acknowledgement and Condolences of Car Accident involving Saluki family** - Again, I know it has been a long year. Unfortunately, a couple of weeks

ago as we know we had a tragic event. Two students died in a car accident. It was a terrible accident to happen at the end of the year. There's a lot of support out there for the students and their families. I appreciate everyone here. There are a few of you on this zoom that have actually chipped in to help out and I appreciate that effort.

- **Unit Effectiveness Plans** - Final piece, our strategic plan. Just so you all know what we're working on. I think to date with the exception of maybe four or five areas we have all of our unit effectiveness plans submitted. What the unit effectiveness plan is really our accountability measure to make sure that each area is focused on one of those five top pillars or priorities. It tells you pretty descriptively what it is that they are working on to move the needle. Some people feel like it's just a document of a strategic plan that will be glossed over and it is not. It really is something that we are going to look at every year. Our upcoming cabinet will be talking through those unit effectiveness plans and making sure that we are trying to move the needle in a number of different areas in relation to the top five pillars. We are trying to move the needle in a number of different areas that were late to the top five pillars. One of the things that I will do is come back to each of these groups and share all of the UEP's that have been put together by cabinet members. You'll be able to see in any given area what exactly it is they are trying to do to move the needle. Believe it or not, it is going to have some impact on this particular group or area. So you do want to see that and we want to be transparent for you.
- **Appreciation of Staff** - On that note, Dr. Shaw I appreciate you and I know that you've got some other things going on that I appreciate. I hope everyone has a great summer and I appreciate all the work that you guys do.

Questions for the Chancellor

Shaw: Thank you, sir. Any questions for the chancellor?

Shaw: Hearing none, we will hear from the provost.

Remarks from Provost: Meera Komarraju

Komarraju: Good morning, everyone. I just have a few updates.

- **Submitting Grades in a Timely Manner** - We are in finals week which means grades are due next week. I'll make my routine plea that all instructors submit grades on time. We've been doing very well and improving our record of grade

submissions. Coming from triple digits, last semester we were down to 63 grades not being submitted by instructors. That is a lot of progress that we have made. This is very helpful to the students if you submit grades on time. Sometimes this might prevent them from getting into graduate school or securing appointment employment. Friendly reminder to everyone. The register's office will be sending reminders on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. The deadline is usually 8:15 in the morning. That's kind of really the most important thing happening right now.

- **Job Searches** - We are also wrapping up some job searches. All of the interviews and feedback are being processed. It takes some steps to make offers and hear back and so on. That will be happening in the next few days.
- **Space Committee Meeting** - Then, we are also going to have a space committee meeting, which has been meaning very regularly. Now that the reorganization is more or less complete, there are lots of units asking when we can consolidate space and move closer to each other. That would be work that we are going to start working on in the second week of May and it will take some time to finish. I wanted to provide that update.
- **Enrollment** - The last one is the update on the enrollment. In terms of our first time and full-time students, our applications are up 18%. Admissions are up 33% so that's very good news. In terms of graduate students, our applications are up 25%. Our admissions are down 17%. We've had some discussion about what that might be due to. Is it because the students do not meet the condition criteria? Do we not have the capacity? There are a number of variables that might explain why applications for graduate school are up and the admissions are down. It might explain why the applications are up and the admissions are down. For transfer students, on-campus applications are down 8.8% and admitted students are down 8.5%. On the flipside, our off-campus applications are up 15% and admissions are up 7%. Typically, for transfer students as we get closer to the start of the semester and end of spring semester, numbers will increase as they make their decision. Typically, the off-campus and on campus compensate for each other and we end up with an increased amount of transfer students. We have been seeing activity in the Saluki step ahead. We have some students that have been omitted in the Saluki step ahead, which is a new initiative that is offered. Those are all of my updates. I would also like to thank everyone for all of the work they've been doing this past year and helping to bring the semester to where it is right now. With that, I'll pause and answer any questions you might have.

Questions for the Provost:

Shaw: Thank you. Questions?

Shaw: Hearing none, we will be hearing from the Vice Chancellor for research, Gary Kinsel.

Remarks from Vice-Chancellor for Research: Gary Kinsel

Kinsel:

- **External Awards** - I have just a few little things to go over. First off, I just want to spend a couple of minutes talking about some of the external awards that we have gotten so far, at least up to quarter three. We just got this information a few days ago. Through quarter three or through the end of March, we have had a total of 272 proposals submitted that could be compared with last year of a total of 249 proposals. That is about a 10% increase so far this year. In terms of awards received, in quarter three we've received \$7.2 million of external grants and contracts. Last year in quarter three we received \$7.4 million in external grants and contracts. The \$7.4 million does exclude the \$9.3 million of cares funds that we have received. That is the money that we have received from the federal government for COVID-19 related responses. When you take the \$7.2 million that we received in quarter three this year and add it to what we've gotten so far in quarter one and quarter two. So far in quarter three we have received \$59.8 million of external grants and contracts. This can be compared with last year through quarter three we had received \$46.1 million in external grants and contracts. This year we are about 30% up from where we were last year. Last year in quarter four we received about \$15.3 million so I think we can say that if we do even just as well as we did last year in quarter four we should easily get over \$70 million in external grants and contracts. I would predict probably \$75 million. If in fact we get \$75 million in external grants and contracts, that will be the highest lower level that we have had in the last nine years. That is a very good trajectory. I think everyone should feel very good about the direction it is going. Everything in my opinion is moving in a positive direction.
- **Quarter Four Awards** - In terms of quarter four, there are a few awards to mention. I was just notified that Keith Gagnon, who has a joint appointment with the school of medicine school of biomolecular sciences, was awarded an NIH-R61 grant which is a \$3.2 million 5-year award. Dr. Harvey Henson in the stem education research center was also awarded a \$5.8 million grant for

preparing exams for the state of Illinois. There are certainly a number of large awards coming in within the next few weeks.

- **Research Expo** - We are in the planning phases of a research expo phase for the fall. Some of you may recall a couple of years ago before Covid we had introduced the idea of having a research expo in the fall. This would be a book end. The expo is an opportunity for the departments, the colleges, PI's, research facilities and any organization who wants to participate to talk about opportunities for undergraduates to participate in research or creative activities. As I said, we did this years ago and it was successful. Students get to see what kinds of things they can get involved with the campus in the research and creative activity arena. Is a bit tentative but my understanding is they are targeting September 20th from 1 to 4 PM to be the date and time for the research expo. This would be the S.C.A.R.E event. If anyone here has something that they would like to put in front of students, especially undergraduate students, that provides opportunities for those undergraduates to get involved please look for the announcements on this. They will be coming out and reaching out to get participants over the summer and into the early part of the fall. Make sure you keep your eyes open for that.
- **Collaborative Research Grant Opportunity** - Last but not least, I want to mention that there is a collaborative grant opportunity. This thing is called the "SIU Collaborative Grant for Health Related research. This has been put on for the last five years as I understand it. Basically, it's an opportunity for faculty members of at least two of the different system institutions but it can be all three who have an interest in some health related research to apply for an inter or intra system grant. The deadline for this in the past has been September 15th, but certainly if you want to work and develop collaborations with someone and try to find some opportunities you will want the summer to be able to reach out to the faculty and colleagues to start having those discussions. At least be aware of this and keep your eyes open for the announcements. It will come out probably sometime mid-summer. I expect the due date to be roughly the same time as it has been in the past. Those are the three things that I had to bring forward this morning. If anyone has any questions, feel free.

Questions for the Vice-Chancellor for Research

Chevalier: I have two questions. The increasing external funding is very impressive. Particularly in this time we all know how difficult this is to get. My first question is how does it compare summer institutions in the same quarter? My second question is do you

attribute this increase in one or more particular factors some initiative that your office did have or anybody else did?

Kinsel: The first question on how it compares I honestly can't answer that. Nobody else puts out their quarterly or midterms numbers. If I look at it in terms of the projection, in other words if we can get up to about \$75 million, that would certainly move us up well in terms of the NSF herd ranking. Right now we are looking at 206 or something like that which is lower than what we've been in the past. Of course, there are some details that I think I should mention. It depends on what we end up reporting to NSF because they focus on research related awards and that number won't be known until after we've been able to compile everything. I have every reason to believe that the report we make to the NSF should have a much better number in it for this year. Again, you won't see that for a couple of years because NSF is always a few years behind in terms of their herd ranking. I expect to move up the ranking for sure. As to why we might've done better, I think we've been hiring good, young faculty which is good. Dr. Komarraju and myself have for the last three years worked very hard to put together very competitive start-up packages for start-up faculty and we've hired some high-quality individuals. On the Carbondale campus, I guess we've managed to get some of the speed bumps ironed out in the whole process. The sponsored projects office is working effectively right now in getting grants processed and submitted. Some of you may not realize this but at one point we were down to roughly 7 people in the office to process all of these awards. We're now over 13 at the present time and there are positions being sought to get us up to 15 employees. That's all been positive in terms of trying to improve the process. I would have to say it's a combination of all of these different things.

Chevalier: Thank you.

Shaw: Provost?

Komarraju: Dr. Ran I'm so glad you asked that question because oftentimes things happen on campus that we do not always understand why it's happening and I think that Dr. Kinsel is being a little modest in giving the reasons. I think he's been very instrumental in making an office very functional and more staffed than it was when he started. I think in terms of the hires and all the years that I've been there I've been asking people to be proactive and start early. If you start early, you have a deeper pool to really move the hiring process along which is important. Small victories in charging a research committee and being able to get the anti-biased training online has taken almost 2 years but now it's possible for staff to be trained and review applications faster. These are little things that altogether make a huge difference.

Kinsel: I would agree and thank you provost for the comment, but I certainly have to give a lot of the credit to the team of the people that work in the sponsored projects office and the research compliance office and the VCR office. It's a small group but I've said it in other venues but I think they're one of the best groups of people on campus. They work really hard to try and support the researchers on campus. I'm very proud of the work they've done.

Ran: I just want to comment from the faculty perspective that it is so important to maintain our credential as a research institution where we want to maintain our implication. It's all very reassuring to hear that we are on the right path.

Kinsel: Thank you.

Shaw: Questions? Comments?

Shaw: Hearing none, we will move on to Dr. Shih.

Remarks from Associate Dean & Director of Graduate School: Stephen Shih

Shih: Thanks Dr. Shaw. Good morning everyone. This is going to be our last grad council meeting for 2021 and 2022. Once this meeting is adjourned, we are going to call to order a special meeting right after this to nominate and elect the leadership for 2022 and 2023. We're going to reconvene again. We're going to have five grad council members whose term is going to expire. We have Dr. Li, Dr. Lee, Dr. Shaw, Dr. Ran and Dr. Burnside leaving. I did want to express my sincere appreciation for your contribution and dedication. It's been a great pleasure working with all of you. Meanwhile, we have to plan the relay again. We will have someone retiring and we will have some people to pick up the position. This year we have gone through a month-long process of new grad council members nomination elections. We have elected 6 new grad council members. We have two from the College of Arts of Media including Dr. Torres and Dr. Pease. We have two members from the College of Health and Human Sciences including Dr. Collins and Dr. Hylin. We have one from the College of Engineering, Computing, Technology, and Mathematics Dr. Velasco. We have one representative from the School of Law, Dr. Rosen, and one representative from the School of Medicine, Dr. Wilber. Please join me in welcoming them. Welcome aboard.

The next item I want to update is the position in the graduate school. We have just recently hired a coordinator of graduate recruitment and retention and basically this position is pretty much like a 3 in 1 position. This person will be in charge of R & R

initiatives not just for the graduate school but also the CIE and School of Law. Tina Sickinger is our best candidate and she will be starting her position on June 1st. She's now the immigration specialist in CIE and we are fortunate to hire her. We would like to thank the Provost for her continuing support.

For my final piece, I just want to give you two deadlines. On May 1, there will be a notification deadline for the GA reemployment. The program must notify the graduate assistant of a decision to either rehire or not to rehire by May 1st. The summer deadline for the summer 2022 contracts need to be submitted by May 1st as well. It has already passed, but I think we missed some.

May 18th we will have an information session for the graduate and professional students on the research and dissertation workshop. It's going to be held via Microsoft teams from 12-1 PM.

That's all I have for today and I'll take any questions you have.

Questions for the Associate Dean & Director of Graduate School

Shaw: Questions?

Shaw: Hearing none, we will move on.

Report from Council Chair: Thomas Shaw

Shaw: As you know, in January the chancellor had charged myself to develop a committee to investigate indirect costs recovery and how that money is spent. We want to look at ways in which we can better utilize those limited resources. The committee is comprised of approximately 17 individuals. We have about five administrators and the rest were faculty research driven faculty. We met every two weeks to discuss these particular aspects.

When we began meeting, the current allocation was 30.6% for the Vice Chancellor of Research & Graduate School Dean, 23% for Deans/Colleges, 23% for the Chancellor, 15% to the FB Cost Recovery Acct., 5% to IT and 3.4% to the library. Now, 44% is for Vice Chancellor of Research & Graduate School Dean, 24% is for the Deans/Colleges, 15% for the Chancellor, 6% for the Office of Sponsored Projects Administration (OSPA), 4% for the Faculty and 7% for the Research Faculty Support. The community was

looking at the end as the charge. Our main idea was to support that pillar regarding research and innovation. The research and innovation to become a research one institution areas of excellence and best and centralized infrastructure and so forth. Well we looked at the areas in which this money was spending and I believe we did come to a consensus that those resources were not being utilized to incentivize increased research and support research in the way that committee felt that it should be done. Initially, I was hoping to have the complete report for you. We've been meeting every two weeks and we met Tuesday for the final report. We had some issues with edits on the report. However, we did vote regarding the proposal model. The proposed model received overall support. Of the 12 that were there, we had an 11 to one affirming this model. Also, I would like to say that although this is a committee model and a committee generated report, Dr. Kinsel was essential and vital in preparing the report, resource and guidance for the report. His contribution was essential for this report. As I say that, I don't want you to think that it's his report because it is not his report. This is the committee's report. Everyone had opportunities to provide input. We had discussions and we had disagreements. We ironed the disagreements out and it was a compromise. I don't know if everyone is 100% happy with us but we're satisfied with it and believe that this is a solid foundation for growth and the whole idea for this was to incentivize faculty and the college to provide support for the units that supported research so that it can grow. Ideally, this is a living document. This will not stay static. Hopefully this will evolve as time progresses but it is a start. That is what I wanted to point out. You can see where we have made some changes here. We did golden reports and looked at some of the expenditures that those dollars went to. A lot of people were scratching their heads thinking how this can be rationalized to support research. One of the charges that the chancellor did at the beginning was to review in case of an audit and try to correct the different areas that might be of concern. We're looking at that. We did provide OSPA with an increase of 6% attempting to incentivize faculty, the PI and the research facility and support. The 15% for the chancellor we would expect to go to IT and the library. Historically, I believe last year or the year before around \$3.5 million is what the university has gotten in the past four endure costs. On this current model, how that would play out you could see that 44% would be about \$1,540,000. Prior to this we did some research with peer institutions. What was their model? That was quite challenging because you can't find that readily. It took some investigating processes in order to come up with some of these numbers. Looking at SIU, between VCR and OSPA about 50% that they would get 24% for the college, the PI would get 4%, the provost would get 15% and research facilities 7%.

What we tried to do is put all of this money into the strategic goals of research and innovation. Now of course with this model as the committee we can allocate the money and we can make suggestions on where that money should be spent or utilized.

Ultimately, the unit Chiefs are going to decide where those dollars go. Hopefully, they will look at this and try to utilize the funds in those particular areas. We've still got this fringe benefit cost recovery debt of approximately \$2 million. We have to pay that and some form. Each of the units that get the money would be responsible for paying a share back. Basically, it turns out to be about 15%. What we have done is we've taken the 44% of the VCR they'll pay 44% of that \$525,000 and so forth. The percentage of indirect cost that each unit gets is the percentage that they pay off at that \$525,000 bill. That roughly translates out about 15% across the board.

Kinsel: Let me try to simplify that a little bit. We still have to pay the fringe benefit deficit unless there is some central address of that problem. It is roughly \$2 million. That's after we've been paying on it for quite a few years. At one point it was up to \$7 million. It will take about four more years to pay this off entirely if we continue to put 15% of the indirect towards that deficit. We are suggesting that each of these identified units that are receiving some of the money will contribute 15% of what they get for the next four years until that dad is retired. In effect, we're still taking 15% off the top. We take 15% and put it towards it and everyone gets the percentages that we've identified as what's left. The deficit was created because of insufficient funds being recovered from the salaries that were paid to researchers. It is not other parts of the university that have generated this deficit. It is a resurgence of salaries that were paid 10 years ago for which insufficient fringe benefit dollars were collected. This account ran into the red and continued to run into the red for a few years. Now, we are trying to correct that and retire that debt. It'll go quicker if our indirect dollars go up.

Shaw: On a positive note, once it's gone each unit will get to keep that. That's pretty much the basic model that we're going to present to the chancellor. Ideally, I wanted to present it to you guys to get your blessing and send it after the meeting. However, we are going to have another meeting with the task force on Tuesday to once again get a finalized approval of the report.

Kinsel: Tom, may I interject?

Shaw: Yes.

Kinsel: I think there are a couple of pieces that should be highlighted. We were very conscious of some of the programs that faculty wanted to see re-introduced. So there are specific statements within the report. For example, of the funding that's returned in the VCR desire percentage some of that will be used to re-introduce the undergraduate assistantship program. We would estimate that probably somewhere between 200 and \$250,000 Would be allocated for that. That would support something on the order of 40

new GA's. Part of the reason that the committee was very interested to see this happen was because it was such a popular program. The very first grad council meeting I came to the very first question I was asked was when are you going to reintroduce the undergraduate GA program. This is a very important program to the faculty. This was built into the proposal as a line item within the VCR funding to be supported. Another thing that's built-in is the reintroduction of a researching creative activities seed program. This would be something like what right now for example the advanced energy Institute does with the funds that they have. This would be a campuswide opportunity for faculty to apply for seed funding to do preliminary work with the goal and the expectation that that work they used as the foundation for submission or external funding from an external funding agency. We want to introduce a seed grant funding program allocate maybe \$150-200,000 for that. Finally, there is an allocation that's been written in for faculty travel. Again, another frequent request that I get is for support for faculty to be able to attend conferences to meet with funding officers to go on professional development activities and for the last quite a few years we haven't been able to support this. Within this 44% of return to the VCR office that program would be re-introduced. All of those things were discussed by the committee and it is in the report that these things should be a part of whatever the VCR office supports. I think those are new ones that unfortunately that you see we had to report. But as Tom was saying we are trying to get the final edits done and get the busing of the committee so it can all be presented to the chancellor.

Shaw: Another thing, this needs to be monitored. One of the suggestions that we had is that we do an annual review of the VCR Office by having them present a review to the Grad counsel via the research subcommittee and indicate where those dollars are being spent. This would attempt to highlight and identify any areas that the committee might believe they have strained away from our charge or strained away from what the dollars are supposed to be going to.

Kinsel: I'll concur with Tom on that. Whoever is in this office should be answerable to the faculty or at least a subset representative of the faculty to ensure that the indirect costs dollars that are received by the university or in fact being returned to support the research enterprise. I would imagine that the committee can make suggestions or recommendations or however you want to say it about the need for maybe changes in the way the dollars are being utilized or perhaps changes in the percentages. Tom mentioned that at the beginning this is a living document. I agree with this very strongly. There are prices of this that I like very much. I personally think it's a great incentive for faculty to go out and get those external awards. The 7% to the research facilities support facility and there's other institutional faculty research support facilities and my opinion is critical. We hear over again from the faculty that research support is dying

strains and we need to be supporting those resources. The bottom line is a faculty member can't write a proposal if they can't get the data that they need to be able to base that proposed idea on. We haven't really had a formalized process for supporting those facilities up to this point in time. I feel like this is a great addition as well.

Questions for Council Chair

Shaw: Any questions or comments?

Lakshmanan: I have a couple of questions. I know there was some discussion about the representation of women faculty. I know to begin with based on SIU Carbondale aside from the medical school I think there was one female faculty member. The SIU Carbondale side was all male faculty. I was just wondering what the composition and what the representation was in terms of diversity? That's one question. The second one is in terms of the deficit. I know that some information was given in the presentation. I would like to know how the deficit came about? Which unit was responsible primarily for the deficit? Ultimately, this 15% across the board for all units that half to return the money to pay for the deficit.

Shaw: I can answer the first question. Seven of the 17 members are female ranging from agricultural sciences to law to analytic finance and economics to curriculum and instruction and med school. So I do believe that there was some representation there. We did take the recommendation that the committee made and tweaked it. I don't recall how we tweaked it but we did add that representation on the committee. I'll let Gary answer that second question.

Kinsel: Who generated the deficit? It was anyone who paid a salary of any kind off of a grant. That's who generated it. At the time that the salaries were being paid, and this would be like I said roughly 5- 10 years ago, we were charging a fringe benefit rate at that time and it simply wasn't enough. it did not cover the actual cost. The way that the fringe benefit Account is operated on a cost recovery account which means as revenue is generated, when faculty pay themselves a salary off of the grant for example then the funding agency transfers the salary and they transfer the fringe benefit dollars. Those dollars are put into a central cost recovery account and, as bills come in that are applied to fringe benefits whether those are insurance bills or whatever they happen to be, the money is taken out. At this period of time that this deficit was generated the amount of money that was being recovered wasn't sufficient to cover the expenses. I was told that there were debates at the time about whether this will get fixed. There was some argument that there was an expectation that eventually the fringe benefit dollars will be sufficient to cover and it just never happened. Over a period of years, that deficit was generated. We now do a cost averaging where we actually hire an external firm to do an audit of our cost and expenses in the last year and they're the ones who recommend the fringe benefit rate that we will use for the next year's group of grants. That's the best answer I can give.

Lakshmanan: Regarding the demographic representation of women and faculty, I think going forward on committees such as this to start off I think for equal representation to have equity. If you have a committee of 20, try to say that there are at least 10 women faculty members so there is more representation. I didn't hear any representation from any faculty and things like humanities and social sciences. Was there representation?

Shaw: No. Basically what we did was we looked at the individuals that were actively involved in NHI grants I believe and actively doing research and grant work. Through discussions with the VCR in myself this is the selection that we came up with. I don't believe we looked at what particular unit they came from. I think the main qualifier is that the activity in grant generation, their expertise and how they do the grants.

Kinsel: That was certainly the starting point to try to get understood very intimately the grant and external funding process. There was a female representative but then she declined due to being out of the country if I recall. The committee was already moving forward at that point. We did take the original request or suggestion to her about trying to include more women scientists. It's not quite half but it's pretty close.

Lakshmanan: The person who was selected but declined just raises another issue that it seems that in these appointments are being made and there is no other kind of process where people are asked if they're interested. Regarding units where they may not have been that grant active compared to other units, I think in terms of the goals I think a goal would be to see innovation and research and all areas as well. I think it would be of the interest then to really ensure that all of our colleges and different areas are represented equally. The process should not be One more people are just automatically appointed. I think there should be some encouragement from people to participate in these things. Maybe the person who was selected declined but there could have been others who would have been willing who are involved in research. I guess I'm just questioning the process.

Shaw: Dr. Dabbs attended the meetings up until the beginning of March when she resigned from the committee and by that time the committee was involved in all of the processes of the investigation and formulating the aspects and we just continued on. Your concerns are noted and all but I also believe that the members that we have as well as their work is reflective of the overall need of the research. No matter what kind of research is going to be done this model will support your activity in a positive way. I don't believe that it will hurt any researcher that is applying for grants. It is only going to enhance their ability to conduct research.

Ran: I have a comment on this. This is my personal opinion that gender and quality is very important. I 100% agree with the decision of the committee of the selection because the major qualifier of the position for this kind of committee should be expertise. And expertise should be an overwhelming qualifier compared to numbers of gender in my opinion. The people who are directly involved in research grants and the decision of the committee will directly affect their activity. I have a question regarding the new model. The research disability support is 7%. Does that include purchasing new equipment or just the maintenance of the facilities?

Kinsel: obviously from a budgetary perspective it's going to come down to how much the maintenance cost versus how much the new piece cost. My expectation is that if we have good years I think we will have sufficient money that the dollars can either be used for purchase of the equipment or for perhaps matching of grant applicant applications to replace equipment for new purchases. It's going to come down to luck of the draw in some sense.

Ran: When research proposals are judged particularly out of one type of mechanism, there is going to be a very hard look on what kind of facilities and abilities we have to conduct research as we propose.

Kinsel: I do understand this and this is one of the reasons why I personally found as a researcher a lot of satisfaction in the idea that at least I'm in the money would be allocated specifically for that. I think that's going to help researchers be competitive.

Ran: is the 4% for personal support or for research?

Kinsel: It would be going into an account under control of the end of visual faculty. There would be an expectation that it would be used and supported for research.

Lefticariu: I have just a comment. I know that the committee did a wonderful job. I suggest that the discussion be a little bit wider because different researchers may affect it in different ways. If they don't know what's going on I feel that would be a drawback long-term. We all want to research for the University to be able to sustain long-term. If some areas are going to be supported more than others, or if some people know better how to use the resources that are available or how this complicated division of phones actually works, I think in the long term if this is not known it's going to hurt. If some people know how these things have to get done, they may not get the benefits of how things work and so forth. This is my suggestion.

Shaw: I understand. I personally believe that that's what this new model is going to do. If you work at the current allocation, you didn't really see where all these dollars went. In fact with the 23% that the chancellor had, we didn't know where those phones were actually going to. On this one, you're seeing it. This document is incentivizing the faculty.

Lefticariu: I said I would like a wider representation for research.

Kinsel: I agree with you. It's actually a requirement and expectation that this report is reviewed every year. I perceive that we may have changes and desires overtime. We might decide at some point that we want one number to go up or one to go down. We're going to look at how the dollars were expended in the previous year but how they should be allocated in the upcoming year. This is our attempt to continue to refine this overtime.

McCarroll: First I want to thank the worst chancellor in the committee for putting this together. The model used to be clear. When you put a proposal together, you could calculate how much

overhead would come back to a unit and you can match funds on that. As a unit now in the model that we have it takes asking questions and there's no rent policy. It also takes two or three calculations to figure out how much little money actually comes back to our unit so that we can use that to base the judgment on matching funds. I think this is a really great development and having a distribution that supports research but also starting a process or we can reevaluate and have some large logic to support the mission of the University. I want to take it to them in the committee for doing this.

Shaw: Thank you. Let's go ahead and move on.

Report from GPSC: Caleb McKinley-Portee

McKinley: Good morning everyone. First, we do have the election updates for those of you who did not get an email. We do have a new Vice President of administrative affairs, O.J. Duncan. We have a new incoming vice president of graduate school affairs and that is graduate counselor GPSC member for the last couple of years, Rachel Nozicka. Rachel has done a lot of amazing work on the graduate council and she has played an important role in rewriting the operating papers during the reformatting that we've been through. She will be taking my place as vice president of graduate school affairs. I think we are all in very capable hands. Our new graduate council members who will be coming in are Alicia Utecht, Jeremy Allen, Avian Wilkins, and Jason Dallas. They will be joining the graduate council for the oncoming 2022-2023 year. I will be taking on the role of the new president of graduate professional student council. I will still get to work with many of you just not in this capacity. With that said, I just want to say thank you for the last two years. I have learned a great deal from many of you. A lot of days I thought yes this is what I meant to do with the rest of my life and other days I want to run from academia screaming. I have learned so much from all of you. I look forward to working with the rest of you in the future. We did have our award ceremony at the end of April. Multiple people received research grants. We had a really amazing turn out. The service award went to our outgoing president and one of the outstanding teaching awards went to one of our graduate council members, Jeremy Allen. We are very pleased and Jeremy is actually here today. Big congrats to him. That is all I have to report. Thank you all very much.

Shaw: Thank you Caleb and congratulations on your new position. Thank you for your service to the committee and your input has been of value. We have appreciated your time.

Report from Council Vice-Chair: Junghwa Lee

Lee: First, I'd like to thank Dr. Kinsel and Dr. Shih for all of your hard work over the years for the council and the research. I really appreciate it. Also, thank you Caleb for your hard work as well. Now, at this time I'd like to share this resolution that I would like to read and consider for Dr. Thomas Shaw. Dr. Shaw, Associate Professor of Healthcare Management and Distinguished faculty in the school of health sciences, has served as the chair of the SIU Carbondale graduate

council for the past year, and as the vice chair of the council for two years prior to that. The graduate council chair and vice chair usually serve only for one year, but Dr. Shaw agreed to serve an extra year as by share for the importance of continually in the council's leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic and the universities reorganization efforts. He has provided valuable service and assistance to the graduate counsel into the leadership of the graduate school by his knowledge, energy, and expertise. He has provided fine leadership to the graduate counsel. The graduate counsel and the graduate school SIU Carbondale express our sincere gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Thomas Shaw for his dedicated contributions to the graduate counsel and the graduate school.

Shaw: Thank you.

Lee: Motion to approve?

O'Donnell: Motion to approve.

McKinley: Seconded.

Lee: Motion is approved.

Resolution in Appreciation of Dr. Thomas Shaw's Service as Grad Council Chair (18-0-0)

Shaw: Thank you. I want to save my comments until the very end. Anything else to report?

Lee: Nothing else to report.

Report from Dean's Council: Segun Ojewuyi

Shaw: Next, we will hear from the Deans Council. Is Segun here? No? Okay.

Report from Faculty Senate: Bethany Rader

Shaw: Dr. Rader informed me that she has a final during this time so she is not able to attend. She did send an email stating that the Senate this past month said goodbye to old members, welcomed new members and has been working on populating the standing committees for the upcoming year. That was her report.

Report from New Programs Committee: Sofia Ran

Ran: The first resolution is regarding to delete two concentrations (Climate and Water Resources and Environment Sustainability) while adding/re-naming one concentration (Environment Geography Sustainability) in the master program for Geography and Environmental Resources. The requested changes are in response to students' demands and

faculty size. The proposed changes are in line with SIU re-organization and similar changes in the curriculum for undergraduate students approved recently. Deletion of the Climate and Water Resources concentration is due to a continuous small number of interested students over the years. The interest in other two specializations (namely, Environment Geography Sustainability and Geographic Information Science) is expected to grow, particularly among STEM students. No negative consequences are anticipated for existing students, faculty, and budget. The proposed changes have been unanimously supported by the departmental faculty who voted Yes: 6, No: 0, and Abstain: 0. Therefore, be it resolved that the Graduate Council recommends approval of the RME to Rename and Reduce the Concentrations in the MS Geography and Environmental Resources.

Shaw: Do I hear a motion to accept?

Philbrook: Moved.

Mckinley: Seconded.

Shaw: Any discussion?

Shaw: Hearing none, all those in favor?

Resolution to Recommend Approval of RME to Rename/Reduce Concentrations in MS Geography and Environmental Resources (19-0-0)

Ran: This next RME is straightforward and is coming from the School of Business. Whereas, the addition of three post-baccalaureate certificates will offer an opportunity for students to earn a graduate certificate in Accounting Analytics, Taxation or Foundation. Whereas, offering studies that lead to a graduate certificate will attract new students. The certificates will be stackable and potentially used for earning a master's degree. Such certificates are likely to appeal to STEM students who are interested in getting a master degree. The studies towards earning the certificates fully meet the goals of the Illinois Public Agenda. Delivery will be during an 8-week period in both in-person and online modes. The faculty is prepared to deliver the courses as they are used also for a master degree. Only minimal budgetary consequences are anticipated connected to advertisement of new certificates. There is unanimous support of the involved faculty who voted Yes: 9, No: 0, and Abstain: 0. Therefore, be it resolved that the Graduate Council recommends approval of the RME for the Post-Baccalaureate (Graduate) Certificates in Accountancy.

Shaw: Do I have a motion to accept?

Wilkins: Moved.

Philbrook: Seconded.

Shaw: Any discussion?

Shaw: Hearing none, all in favor?

Resolution to Recommend Approval of RME for Post-Baccalaureate (Graduate) Certificates in Accountancy (19-0-0)

Ran: Ongoing re-organization of the University led to recent formation of the new School of Education. Whereas, creation of this new school offers an opportunity to restructure and re-name existing degrees to better represent the programs. Seven changes are proposed including re-naming Workforce Education and Development (WED) into Organizational Learning, Innovation and Development (OLID), discontinuing some specializations while adding new concentrations and post-baccalaureate certificates. Among other changes, new CIP code for BS and MSED in OLID will be added. The new master degree and two new post-BS certificates will be offered online which is a preferable mode of education for many students. The four new areas of specialization in OLID will include Human Resources Development, Learning and Performance Technology, Online Learning, and Workforce Training and Development. The curriculum will be delivered by existing faculty well familiar with the courses to be offered. No negative consequences are anticipated for existing students and faculty. The budgetary consequences are minimal and can be covered from existing funds. Appropriate changes will be made in the graduate catalog to reflect re-naming, deletions and addition of concentrations in BS and MSED degrees. The proposed changes have been unanimously supported by the School of Education faculty who voted Yes: 6, No: 0, and Abstain: 0 as well as the College Curriculum Committee members who voted Yes: 3, No: 0, and Abstain: 0. Therefore, be it resolved that the Graduate Council Committee recommends approval of the RME for Multiple Changes in the Workforce Education Program.

Shaw: Do I have a motion to accept?

O'Donnell: Moved.

Philbrook: Seconded.

Shaw: Any discussion?

Shaw: Hearing none, let's call for a vote.

Resolution to Recommend Approval of RME to Multiple Changes in the Workforce Education Program (22-0-0)

Shaw: The next RME should be on your screen for the Resolution to Not Recommend Approval of RME for Elimination of Master Degree in Education (MSED) for Special Education in the School of Education.

Ran: This RME was unusual. On April 7th, we proposed a RME to recommend approval. However, we had an unusually high number of 14 faculty abstain from voting. The vote was 9-1-14. Given this number, we did not think it was a good idea to eliminate this program. We decided as a committee to reverse the RME. Enrollment in this program has been declining in recent years and has been suspended in 2018. There are no students currently enrolled in the program. The program is now considered to be less attractive to students since Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) eliminated the requirement for a master degree to become a director of special education. There are no anticipated effects on faculty, staff and students in the School of Education as well as other university units. There are only minimal budgetary effects. Appropriate changes will be made in the upcoming graduate catalog. The faculty voted Yes: 9, No: 14, and Abstain: 1. Note the previously erroneously reported vote of Yes: 9, No: 1, and Abstain: 14. Therefore, the New Programs Committee recommends the following: 1) to rescind the previous approval of the Graduate Council for this RME as this approval was based on an incorrectly reported number of supporting faculty; and 2) not recommend the approval of the elimination of Master degree in Education (MSED) for Special Education.

Shaw: Do I hear a motion to accept?

Philbrook: Motion to accept.

Shaw: I'll second it.

Questions for New Programs Committee

Donahoo: I have a point I want to make. The reason why this RME came up is because there is no enrollment. While some faculty did support keeping the program, the bottom line is IBAG mandated we get rid of it because there's no enrollment. If we, SIU, keep maintaining programs that have no enrollment IBAG will act and not approve new programs when we need them. This can literally hurt the entire system. Be careful when you vote to support a program that has no enrollment that we don't anticipate having enrollment because it is no longer connected to a state endorsement. When people come for the state endorsement and can get the degree at a bachelors level, they are not going to pay for the Masters level when they can get it at an undergraduate cost.

Ran: Can I ask you a question? Why did we have 14 faculty who are opposed to that?

Donahoo: Because faculty do not want to necessarily get rid of programs. I understand their argument. People expressed fear that if we get rid of the program that we can't get it back. They're correct. We may not get it back because the bottom line is when it was initially created The master's degree was connected to a state endorsement because that's the way the state set it up. Now that the endorsement is connected to a bachelor's degree, there's not as much motivation or interest in the program which is why there is no enrollment.

Bruns: I'm here to speak for the program. I am in a special ed program. I've been a SIU for 20 years. Let me clarify that the masters have always been separate. It is not an endorsement. The

endorsement courses so after the student has their licensure from the state board of Ed the teacher can come back and add endorsement areas. We've always had a structure that the endorsement Courses count as undergraduate and graduate level. The master of science in education is totally different. We have emphasis areas where we have special ed teachers who returned to work on that advanced degree. They can focus on a number of areas. We ran into trouble with enrollment when having a minimum number of students across the different emphasis areas so we were able to offer those courses. We could offer our core courses because we would have enough people for that. But to have five or more students and an emphasis area became the issue. We moved forward in 2018 to suspend the program in terms of new admissions because we were having issues bringing in teachers in the region because they could do a lot of their professional work through their districts. Saran was correct that people don't want to pay. We did have some international students. Again, we would have interest of maybe half a dozen people but by the time they applied only to pass the language requirement. We had hoped in 2018 to put a pin in it and suspend the admissions and have time to kind of regroup and recruit. What happened in 2018 as well was when our faculty left. We were down to two people trying to juggle and keep this Masters program buyable. That's really where we ended up having all of our difficulties was trying to cover everything that we needed to cover and finish out those master students that we had. We have tried to start discussions to talk to the folks that are in the reading specialist area to work together. This RME kind of started before we started before we were able to make headway. We from the Special Ed perspective, want to hold onto that Masters and are more than willing to look at other options. The way it has been is no longer working.

Shaw: I guess I have a question in regards to the 24 faculty that voted. This is representative of the school of education, not the program itself.

Bruns: No, it's the entire school. We are one unit.

Shaw: So in the entire school of education, 14 voted no on this.

Bruns: Yes.

Shaw: Any other questions or comments?

Philbrook: I guess I have two questions that are related in a way. The first is has the IBAG communicated to the program that this is a problem or is this a feel about the IBAG?

Donahoo: They have communicated that we either add students or let it go.

Philbrook: Then the second question is wouldn't they recognize this pause as being a well formed response to that request to drop the program?

Donahoo: No, because we're too advanced in the polls. Because the past started in 2018, they really want you within three years to add enrollment or let it go. We're past the three years and this is their deadline.

Philbrook: Thank you.

Anagnostopoulos: Excuse me, may I ask something? We reviewed this proposal. Could it be possible somehow to amend the proposal with this information because I don't believe it was described there. From our perspective we saw 14 no votes and it's kind of going to against the will of the faculty.

Shaw: So, you're asking about doing a friendly amendment to this resolution? Is that what you're asking?

Anagnostopoulos: If it is possible, yes.

Shaw: Well, I mean if we get approval from the committee. What would that friendly amendment be? I guess we would need to change the title of the resolution to "recommend the approval"? Is that The first part of it that you're talking about?

Anagnostopoulos: Yeah, I mean what I was saying is the associate provost can add some clarity here. When we reviewed this proposal, Sophia mentioned we do not understand this thing about the IBAG and their need to eliminate this program with no obstacles in the future. Do we know the distribution of the votes inside the school of special education? This is their program. Did everybody vote in favor?

Bruns: Yes, there are three of us and the special education that wants to keep the masters. I think it's as I said we had one faculty member leave since we put a pause on it in 2018 and then we had re-organization and then we had Covid. It really was not a favorable time to regroup and rebrand and start recruiting. We thought we would have time to kind of get to our next steps but the world kind of intervened. Then, this RME started going through before we had a chance. I didn't realize we were on this three-year deadline.

Chevalier: Now, first let me say anytime that you were looking at eliminating programs especially when we consider the contributions of our faculty that this has been who they are and how they identify in their contributions. There is nothing easy about it so lots of respect to you Dr. Bruns. The IBAG never directly talks to programs and provides them with insight. They have policies that we look at. Once we suspend the program, and the program has zero enrollment at that point IBAG looks at five years. Then, they say it's time to permanently illuminate the program. So when the colleges are also looking at resources and saying that the program has steadily declined and is at zero decline and has made the decision to suspend enrollment they also look at those factors. My point was to clarify the role of IBAG and the decision making processes. This is simply their policy. Any questions on what I just said?

Ran: I think that I don't necessarily have enough knowledge to understand and reconcile this information. But I would say that as an outsider, when I read and our people in the committee read this RME a lot of votes did not come through. I think this RME should be revised.

Chevalier: I take your criticism. But typically an RME doesn't go into this IBAG policy. This RME simply looks at what it means to the institution and in this particular situation the school. You know this is a program we want to eliminate because of zero enrollment. I understand your point and I think that definitely RME's can be a little more thorough in that respect.

Boulukos: I think this discussion is getting a little bit beside the point. There may be urgent reasons to end the program but what this motion is saying in front of us is about the fact that the information was miss reported and that therefore we want to reconsider. The committee voted to approve The removal of the program based on erroneous information. I think it's important because the vote was misreported in the RME. That was the crucial issue in front of us. We don't want to establish a precedent where it's OK to submit an RME with incorrect information when your case is urgent. I'm sure it was an innocent mistake but we just didn't have the right information when we brought it forward and that led to it being approved. Then we found out the information was wrong. That's why the committee wants to reconsider this. I think it's important to keep that in mind. What this is really about is the vote was miss reported and the information and the RME was incomplete and was improved based on wrong information.

Chevalier: I don't think this RME was incomplete. There may be other points of you and I get that. The reason I sent it back and stopped it was when I recognized that the vote was wrong. I sent this back saying sorry about this and please reconsider.

Shaw: How about we do a friendly amendment to rescind the resolution of the RME and send the RME back for further review? The body can look at this and look at this at the beginning of the year and August to investigate and either approve or disapprove the resolution.

Ran: I would be fine with that. I think it's proper.

Donahoo: Please don't do that because sending it back will not change anything. The faculty does not want to talk about it again and the faculty does not want to revote. I accept their vote and I accept their opinion but if you send it back we don't have time to look at this again. The things that we need to do to work with IBAG get held up when we have to keep working on the same RME.

Bruns: The pause would give us an opportunity to speak with the reading specialist folks.

Donahoo: You can still do that. The thing is if we're still working on the same RME we're going in the wrong direction. You can still propose either a second cognate within the existing MSED which you can always do or you can propose a new MSED where reading specialists in special education work together. The process that you need to go through does not involve this RME. This prevents you from doing what you need to do rather than helps you.

McCarroll: You can and I think the friendly resolution that Tom was proposing would go technically back to the committee. This may allow us to ask questions from various people. I don't think he was suggesting that it would send it all the way back to the very beginning.

Shaw: I think the body needs to have a better understanding. I personally would vote against a 14 no count without understanding the situation. I guess my main issue on this is to stop the approval of that resolution in April so that that is corrected. If the council in August wants to approve that through review that's their decision.

Shaw: I'm asking for input. How do you guys want to do this?

Ran: I think it should be two separate RME's. I don't think we can accept approval from April because the numbers were not correct. We just cannot support this. The second was the actual substance. I would agree that the post would actually be beneficial and would allow the graduate counsel and the committee to look into this and the issues involved. I think the second one should be postponed to September but the first one is straightforward.

Shaw: Do I have a friendly motion to accept this as a friendly amendment to accept the changes?

McCarroll: Moved.

O'Donnell: Seconded.

Shaw: Pretty much everything in the RME is the same except I changed it to state, "Therefore, the new programs committee recommends rescinding the previous approval of the graduate council for this RME as this approval was based on an incorrectly reported number of supporting faculty." So I hear a motion to accept the motion as written?

Donahoo: So you're sending it back?

Shaw: This is a motion that we are going to rescind the approved resolution back in April. In April, we approved this RME due to faulty data. What we want to do is correct our mistakes there.

Donahoo: Thank you.

Philbrook: I would also add to the RME that and return it to the new programs committee for correction clarification. Otherwise, I do think it would void the RME and would suggest that the school would need to start over.

Shaw: Is the addition alright with you?

Philbrook: Yes.

Shaw: Do I have a motion to accept as written?

McCarroll: Moved.

Boulukos: Seconded.

Shaw: All those in favor to resend the recommended approval of RMA for elimination of master degree in education MSED for special education in the school of education.

Resolution to Recommend Not Approving the RME for the Elimination of the MSED in Special Education-Revised (13-0-2)

Ran: Do we still have enough people to vote on the last RME?

Shaw: I counted 10 people. I think we've got 19 members. Steven can you confirm that? I thought we had around 27 members. Do you guys think that we should suspend this one and suspend it for next year?

Donahoo: Can we please stop doing that?

Shaw: Well, we've got to have some sort of order involved in this.

Donahoo: Are you about to convene the next council? Because if there's a quorum for the next council they could consider this one and this would be their first order of business and then they can move on.

Shaw: That is an excellent suggestion that way there would be a quorum.

Shih: Dr. Shaw we have a total of 20 graduate council members.

Shaw: Does anyone object to holding that over to the next meeting that is going to be right after this meeting is over? Sophia, is that okay for you?

Ran: That is okay. We can pass it on.

Shaw: I am going to hold off on this and it will be discussed at the next meeting.

Report from Research Committee

Shaw: Philip, in regard to the research committee do you have anything to report?

Shaw: No report from Philip.

Report from Program Review Committee: Ed O'Donnell

O'Donnell: Nothing to report.

Report from Educational Policies Committee: Craig Gingrich-Philbrook

Philbrook: I would just report that we're still looking into the question regarding transcripts in relation to international students. I worked to create a meeting with the incoming director of the center for international education (CIE). We have not been able to set that up. We're continuing to move on that and try to get the information to make a good decision.

Shaw: Thank you.

Shaw: That brings us to the end. Before we adjourn, I just want to take a few minutes to thank everyone for their activity and input into the committee. It's been an eye-opening experience for me. I do want to give a shout out to the chairs of the sub committee Junghwa Lee and Caleb as the representative for the GPSC and Sophia Who has been quite busy with the new programs and Phillip who has been on research committee and O'Donnell and Philbrook with their respective committees. Their input and expertise has given us guidance and support. This has been greatly appreciated. Also, the administration Dr. Lane and the Provost and vice provost. Their guidance has been extremely helpful. I also want to give a particular shout out to the VCR Dr.Kinsel. His support and guidance has been essential not just particularly with the report but also throughout my research. Dr. Shih has also given guidance and support and has been greatly appreciated. With that said, thank you all for your service and I adjourn this meeting.

Adjournment of First Meeting

Shih: If no objections, we're going to start our special meeting to nominate and elect the new graduate Council leadership for 2022 and 2023. We're going to nominate and elect a chair and vice chair for the graduate council. First, let's make a nomination for chair for the graduate council.

O'Donnell: I would like to nominate Craig-Gingrich-Philbrook as the chair for the upcoming year.

Shih: I'd like to make a motion to approve Dr. Craig Gingrich-Philbrook as the chair of the graduate council for 2022 and 2023. Did I jump the gun? I'd like to ask for other nominations. Do we have any other nominations?

Shih: Hearing none, nominations for the chair are now closed. I make a motion to approve Philbrook as chair.

O'Donnell: Seconded.

Shih: Any discussions or questions?

Shih: Let's vote on the motion.

Nomination for Craig Gingrich-Philbrook as the Graduate Council Chair for the 2022-2023 Academic Year (14-0-1)

Shih: Now, I think the new chair will nominate a vice chair from the floor.

Philbrook: It is my understanding that I would be on the graduate council and get to know folks longer. The people that I contacted thinking that they were still on the council have had replacements made. I think what I would say is I would be really interested in diversity in the leadership and welcome folks who might want to self nominate from the standpoint of the conversation we had about the need to have equity. I think we could talk about other demographic characteristics. Also, I should say for those of you that don't know me that I am in the school of communication studies and that my own work tends to be a little bit more in relation to humanities. There's a part of me that also would like to have a vice chair that would be in the sciences. Any of those factors of difference or diversity leadership would be meaningful to me. I would ask folks who might be interested to self nominate and to talk a little bit about how they might approach that role. My understanding from Tom is that that person is primarily responsible for helping to get representation on the different kinds of committees and search committees and things that are formed where we would be working together and things of that capacity.

Shih: Thank you and congratulations. Craig and I are going to be working together in the next week or two to figure out the committee members. I'm going to be sending out an email in the next week for your preference to serve on various committees for 2022 and 2023. Any other business to discuss?

Ran: We still have to look at the RME that Sophia has.

Report from New Programs Committee: Sofia Ran

Ran: This RME is recommending approval of merging, relocation and naming of doctoral degrees in the school of education and the school of human sciences. Whereas, six out of the existing seven doctoral degree programs in the school of education will be merged into one program with six different areas of study as opposed to previously offered six concentrations. Merging of the six doctoral programs into one will permit better management of the program and will accurately reflect the number of enrolled students in different areas of study. Delivery of curriculum remains unchanged for the merged six programs in the school of education. The remaining one doctoral program and health education will be moved into the school of human sciences and renamed into population health. The other health related BS and MPH degree programs have been moved into school of human sciences, College of health and human sciences in 2020 and the current proposed move follows the same re-organization. Delivery of curriculum for the renamed population health program will be responsible for the school of human sciences. The existing students will have the option to continue with their selected tracks or move into newly organized programs. The changes are expected to be reflected in the next

catalog. The expected budgetary consequences will be addressed from existing funds. Whereas, the faculty of the school of education strongly supported these changes. The faculty voted Yes: 23, No: 0, and Abstain 2. Therefore, be it resolved that the graduate council committee recommends approval of the RME to merging, relocation and naming of doctoral degrees in the school of education and the school of human sciences. I think McCarroll can add to concerns that we're brought up.

McCarroll: I can add to that. My main concern is that the major category was changed from education to health. There just wasn't enough information in the RME to really follow what was happening and that it was well supported. In the beginning of the process of a valuation, the websites were still a complete mess. It was hard to even tell which faculty were associated. Most of the questions that I asked were trying to clarify that so that we could properly evaluate the proposal. Since that time, the websites are more clarified so I can see that we actually have the expertise that's there and so that really removed the primary concerns that I had.

Ran: I think we did conclude as a committee to assess this properly and to ask all of the necessary questions but I do feel that we got the answers and clarification that we wanted. The committee does approve of this RME.

Philbrook: Motion to approve?

O'Donnell: Moved.

Boulukos: Seconded.

Philbrook: Those in favor, please vote in the chat.

Resolution to Recommend Approval of Merging, Relocation and Renaming of Doctoral Degrees in the School of Education and the School of Human Sciences (11-0-2)

Philbrook: Was this RME the last one?

Ran: Yes, we have cleared everything that went for the committee and we had the discussion. There is one RME that was submitted just recently and we did not have time to attend the committee meeting. In the September meeting we will have to discuss this RME. Every RME submitted until April 22nd has been discussed.

Philbrook: Thank you. I believe this is the end of our meeting for today.

Adjournment

Philbrook: Motion to adjourn?

McCarroll: Moved

Boulukos: Seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 10:42 AM