

## **2015 GRADUATE COUNCIL**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**October 1, 2015**

The meeting was called to order at 08:00 by Dr Yueh-Ting Lee.

**Members Present:** Joseph Shapiro, Michael Brown, Johnathan Flowers, Cinzia Padovani, Andrew Pardieck, Alison Watts, Norman Carver, Constantine Hatziadoniu, John Barnard, Richard McKinnies, Tomas Velasco, Sandy Kim, Prema Narayan, Randolph Burnside, Julie Partridge, Natalie Nash, Greg Rose, Michael Eichholz, Boyd Goodson, Amanda Barnard, Gray Whaley.

**Members Absent:** Conrad David, Dick Bradley, Jamie McNutt, Greg Rose, Ratna Sinha, Corné Prozesky, Silvia Secchi, Clayton Nielson, Cynthia Sims, Kenneth Stickers.

**Proxies:** Jonathan Remo for Silvia Secchi, Charles Ruffner for Clayton Nielson, Todd Headrick for Cynthia Sims, Robert Hahn for Kenneth Stickers.

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Brad Colwell, Susan Ford, James Garvey, James Allen, Yueh-Ting Lee, Andy Wang.

**Ex-Officio Members Absent:** Randy Dunn.

#### **Consideration of minutes**

M. Eichholz asked for the minutes of the previous meeting to be considered. G. Whaley pointed out that the Faculty Senate was not invited to the last meeting. Minutes passed.

Chair of the Graduate Council, M. Eichholz introduced the new Interim Chancellor B. Colwell.

#### **Remarks – Interim Chancellor B. Colwell**

Dr Colwell undertook to work with the Graduate Council to find solutions for the budget situation. He commented that SIU is not the only institution faced with budget challenges. Dr Colwell also mentioned that he is committed to improving undergraduate recruitment and retention. He briefly referred to the university rankings and noted that SIU is doing well and has a good story to tell. He also mentioned that he is starting a Twitter account to expand communication lines.

#### **Remarks - Provost S. Ford**

Dr Ford reported that searches for vacant positions for the Dean of Library Affairs, College of Business, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Provost for Enrollment Management and Retention, a new Director for the Center for International Education, an Executive Director for Extended Campus, and a Chief Information Officer are underway.

She also reported that to improve undergraduate enrollment her office together with the Director of Undergraduate Admissions are conducting a study to establish where undergraduate students go when they do not come to SIU. Through this process SIU will learn of its competitors. Such information will help with recruitment efforts from Illinois schools. She added that local high schools will be trained to become advocates for SIU. Dr Ford further reported that, in preparation for the accreditation review the university must be fully assessing student learning in core curriculum classes starting in Fall 2016. For the review to be approved, a full three years of sustainable data set are necessary. This is why data collection must begin in Fall 2016 in preparation for 2019. She highlighted that faculty members teaching core curriculum classes are charged with developing assessment tools and added that if data are not collected in a core curriculum class, the class will no longer be able to be part of the core.

She also reported that she is working with the Dean of University College and advisors in the exploratory student group to form a committee of individuals who have expertise in working with underprepared students. She hopes that efficiently helping underprepared students will improve the university's reputation and student success. She added that SIU is moving to a multi-factorial model of evaluating underprepared students. Dr Ford also announced that she will not be in the next meeting as she will be in meetings in China in support of one of SIU's programs and will be launching the first international alumni association in Malaysia.

### **Consideration of Program Evaluation Resolution**

Dr Ford stressed that there is a need to move forward with a cross-campus evaluation of SIU undergraduate and graduate programs. She mentioned that such an evaluation has not been done since the early 1990s. She also commented that she can do the evaluation of programs herself (or ask the Deans to do it) but believes that program evaluation is the role of faculty. She commented that she drafted the charge letter following consultations with President Dunn and Interim Chancellor Colwell.

### **Graduate Council Resolution on the Formation of a Campus-Wide Program Evaluation Committee**

**M. Eichholz** read the resolution and invited discussion.

**A. Barnard** asked about the role of Faculty Senate in the Campus-Wide Program evaluation. M. Eichholz responded that there has been communication with G. Whaley and A. Imre of the Faculty Senate to form one committee. The executive members of the Graduate Council want to proceed promptly and hope that the Faculty Senate will join so that one committee can be formed for the evaluation. He added that the Graduate Council will still proceed, even without the participation of the Faculty Senate.

**G. Whaley** commented that there have been two meetings and that he has exchanged comments with Dr Ford on the charge letter. He reported that the

Faculty Senate will form a committee that will submit by March 1, 2016 criteria to be used for evaluation. He added that the Faculty Senate will not use its resources to produce data that it will not have control over how it is used.

**C. Hatziadoni** asked for clarity on whether the Faculty Senate will participate in the program evaluation. G. Whaley responded that the Faculty Senate will participate by producing a list of criteria and will seek guidance from upper administration about where it wants to take the university.

**M. Eichholz** agreed that upper administration's criteria for program evaluation may not be the same as that developed by faculty members. He also agreed that the evaluation is a huge time investment but that faculty members' involvement in the process is important since Dr Ford has mentioned that the administration can do the evaluation on its own.

**C. Hatziadoni** asked about the criteria to be used for forming the program evaluation committee. M. Eichholz responded that the criteria to form the committee is covered under the second resolution. He also suggested that Assistant Professors should consider identifying proxies since the program evaluation work is demanding.

**C. Hatziadoni** asked how the members from the Graduate Council will be selected in cases in which a college has two representatives on the Council. M. Eichholz responded that such details have not been finalized but that if more than one members from a single college volunteers, the GC may have to develop some type of voting mechanism.

**C. Padovani** asked for assurance from Dr Ford that the program evaluation work done by faculty members will be considered as part of decision-making by upper administration.

**Dr Ford** responded that SIU has not undertaken a campus-wide program evaluation in 25 years. She also commented that she is not aware of the existence of a list of programs to be eliminated. Dr Ford stressed that the evaluation will reveal the extent programs on campus are interrelated. She also commented that SIU has been advised that the campus has too many programs and that campuses the size of SIU with similar missions generally have between 70 and 80 undergraduate programs. SIU has 106 programs. She also emphasized that the evaluation will not prevent cuts that may occur in response to a decline in State funding and programs that were cut previously were those that did not meet the State criteria.

**C. Hatziadoni** asked about expected outcomes from the evaluation process. Dr Ford responded that she has asked that faculty identify five categories of program productivity: top 10%; top 25%; lowest 10%; lowest 25% and mid 50% by whatever criteria deemed appropriate.

**C. Hatziaioniu** commented that he is uncomfortable participating if the Faculty Senate does not participate. The administration should tell faculty which programs should be closed.

**Dr Wang** commented that having faculty lead the process is reasonable since faculty members have more detailed information about programs.

**A. Pardieck** asked about programs included in the charge memorandum. Dr Ford clarified that degrees in the Law School are funded differently and that she had not envisioned the Juris Doctor (JD) degree to be part of the review. Similarly, the Doctor of Medicine (MD) degree at the School of Medicine will not be part of the evaluation. However, graduate programs at the School of Medicine will be part of the review.

**M. Eichholz** addressed C. Hatziaioniu's concerns regarding the program evaluation. He commented that while there is no guarantee on how information will be used by the administration, the involvement of faculty in the program evaluation is an opportunity to play a role in shared governance.

**J. Flowers** asked whether graduate courses that offer certificates are included in the evaluation and if the Medical/Dental Education Preparatory Program (MEDPRED) is defined as a graduate program. Dr Ford responded that she is open to modifying the phrasing of the charge to include an individualized look at sub-divisions that are approved programs by the Illinois Board of Higher Education. She added that she can, depending on the decision of the Graduate Council, modify the charge to exclude minors and concentrations.

**P. Narayan** commented that MEDPREP is not a degree program. J. A. Allen responded that MEDPREP has related degree programs such as the Masters of Science in which students often enroll.

**Y. Lee** commented that he supports the involvement of the faculty in shared governance. He mentioned that faculty involvement in program evaluation is included in the criteria used to evaluate universities. He added that when the High Learning Commission visits SIU it appreciates faculty involvement in the assessment process.

**T. Velasco** commented that faculty members cannot avoid the program evaluation process. He further noted that the Graduate Council must first determine a performance matrix that will guide the evaluation across all the colleges. He also asked Dr Ford if the program evaluation outcomes will be binding. In response, Dr Ford assured the Graduate Council that there is commitment from President Dunn and Interim Chancellor Colwell that the outcome of the program evaluation will be used as a primary guiding document for decision making to the degree possible.

**M. Eichholz** asked if Dr Ford can amend the charge to reflect her undertaking that the outcome of the program evaluation will be the primary guide in decision

making. Dr Ford stated that the language of the charge has already been amended and that M. Eichholz has an earlier draft of the charge letter.

**R. Burnside** agreed that faculty should play a role in program evaluation but suggested that the Deans of Colleges should play a larger role and devise a formula to be used. Dr Ford clarified that having faculty own the program evaluation process does not preclude the Deans' and Associate Deans' involvement.

**C. Ruffner** voiced his support for faculty involvement in shared governance.

**B. Goodson** commented that the faculty cannot abdicate its responsibilities and that faculty is better suited to provide input, rather than upper administration. Faculty can counterbalance the business model used by administration. He added that faculty can seek advice from administration and other colleagues.

**M. Eichholz** commented that the Faculty Senate had mentioned that the Provost and an ex-officio member should be part of the process.

**Dr Allen** mentioned that no degree program has ever been eliminated without prior consultation with the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. The record shows that where the administration has disagreed with faculty's input, that has been to save, rather than eliminate, programs.

**G. Whaley** commented that the Graduate Council must be realistic about the powers it has since SIU is a corporate environment, adding that faculty only owns the process, not the decisions.

**M. Eichholz** called for a vote for the resolution to form a Campus-Wide Program Evaluation Committee. 21 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions. **Resolution passed.**

### **Resolution on the Format of a Campus-Wide Program Evaluation Committee**

**M. Eichholz** read the resolution.

**C. Hatziadoni** asked about the expected number of committee members. M. Eichholz responded that the committee will have 13 members but if the Faculty Senate decides to join, the number will double to 26 members. A decision needs to be made about reducing the number, should the Faculty Senate join the committee.

**B. Goodson** commented that the committee should have a wide section of members.

**R. Burnside** asked whether the resolution can be amended to reflect that an ex-officio member can be included in the committee.

**M. Eichholz** mentioned that he will add (at the end of the resolution) the words, "and ex-officio member determined appropriate by the committee."

**J. Flowers** recommended that at least one or two other student members (besides A. Barnard who is on the executive of the Graduate Council) be included in the

committee. M. Eichholz responded that the issue of student representation was discussed by the executive committee and that one student representative can be added. He also added that he will include as an amendment the recommendation to have an additional student representation in the Campus-Wide Program Evaluation Committee so the Graduate Council can vote on it.

**C. Hatziadoniu** suggested that one more student be included.

**A. Barnard** mentioned that she was not at the executive committee meeting that discussed the issue of student representation in the format of a Campus-Wide Program Evaluation Committee.

**M. Eichholz** called for a vote to amend the resolution to include ex-officio members in the committee. 27 in favor of the amendment, 1 abstention, 0 opposed.

**J. Barnard** recommended that two graduate students be included so that they can represent various colleges, and ensure diversity.

**M. Eichholz** called for a vote to add one graduate student to the committee being formed. 11 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstention. **Motion passed.**

**A. Barnard** undertook to contact M. Eichholz about the additional student representative.

**M. Eichholz** called for a vote to include amendments to the resolution on the format of a campus-wide program evaluation committee. 22 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention. **Resolutions carried.**

**M. Eichholz** mentioned that he will contact the representatives before the end of the week to see if they are interested in serving on the committee, and, if not, then request the representatives to nominate proxies.

#### **Remarks – Interim Vice Chancellor for Research Dr Garvey**

Reminded the Graduate Council of the end of October deadline for Graduate Fellowship programs. The fellowships are for students who are U.S. citizens and offer \$32, 000.00 per year. A workshop has been arranged for October 5, to provide more information about the fellowships.

#### **Remarks – Graduate School Dean Dr Lee**

Reported that SIU has 3825 graduate students for Fall semester 2015; 2657 Masters students and 1168 Doctoral students. He noted that there are 252 fewer graduate students than the previous year (175 Masters and 77 Doctoral students). The low enrollment numbers could be partly a result of Graduate Faculty members not making decisions on applications. Last year there were 780 no-decision applications. As courtesy to applicants and for good auditing results, Dr Lee asked that faculty members should either accept, decline or defer applications. He also reported on two meetings he attended. The first was with GPSC and the second was the first Graduate Enrollment Task Force which was attended by 22 individuals (including graduate students and graduate faculty members). The Graduate

Enrollment Task Force formed four working groups (International Working Group, Domestic and Underrepresented Working Group, Innovative and Technology Working Group and the Internal Efficiency Improvement Working Group). The groups will meet at the members' convenience. Dr Lee reminded the members that Form 90 and 90A, related to the graduate catalogue, are due October 1. The announcement of the outstanding graduate thesis award was sent out in September. For the outstanding dissertation award, the announcement will go out in December.

**C. Hatziadoni** commented that graduate students fall into different funding categories and the data should reflect the different categories of students. This will help to identify the category where the major drops in enrollment are happening. Dr Lee responded that the Chairperson of the Internal Efficiency Improvement Working Group is currently doing surveys to establish more detail. Dr Lee also commented that it is important to have quality students that meet SIUC's standards. He also stressed that faculty members did not take decisions based on the prevailing situation of a lack of funds. He further indicated that, in the area of providing graduate students with financial assistance, SIUC is above national average. The university supports 40% of Masters students, compared to the national average of approximately 25%. Similarly, SIU supports 80-90% of Doctoral students, while the national average is between 50% and 60%.

**C. Hatziadoni** asked whether funding decisions are made by departments or by the Graduate School. Dr Lee responded that decisions are made at departmental and faculty levels.

**N. Nash** commented that graduate students base their decisions on graduate school choices on schools that provide funding. Dr Lee responded that, in meetings with Deans of Colleges, he is an advocate for graduate student funding.

#### **Remarks - Associate Provost for Academic Programs Dr Allen**

Dr Allen handed out a flier that provides a potential resource for graduate faculty in their evaluation of degree programs. Academic Analytics provides a valuable source of comparative data on degree programs both on-and off-campus. For their work this winter, Graduate Council members, who are serving on the program evaluation committee, need to be familiar with this database and should at least attend one workshop session. There is a session specifically arranged for members of the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. Other sessions have been arranged for the College of Science and the College of Liberal Arts. Dr. Allen also mentioned another workshop that is sponsored by OSPA that will focus on a different database, Activity. This database covers faculty activities drawn from their CVs. Dr Allen also mentioned an assessment day conference for faculty interested in assessment of student learning outcomes to see how this activity will affect graduate programs.

#### **Remarks - Council Chair Dr Eichholz**

Apologized to Dr Whaley for inadvertently excluding him from the email list.

### **First reading of the Graduate Council Resolution Research and Creative Activities Resolution**

M. Eichholz read the resolution for the first time. He undertook to change the word 'assessment' to 'evaluation' so as to separate the resolution from the assessment discussed earlier. He explained that the resolution is a response to the budget reduction proposal recently circulated by President Dunn. The budget makes it clear that research is not considered a core activity. M. Eichholz also reported that Interim Chancellor Colwell did not discourage the resolution but wishes to be given time to provide his own insight into the budget reduction and to restate his belief that research is a core activity. M. Eichholz noted that the resolution has two key parts: the recurring aspect and the part about the 10% cut. If the approach to the budget cut does not change the Graduate Council still needs to pass the resolution. He also mentioned that the Interim Chancellor wants to meet the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council in the next two weeks.

**C. Hatziadoni** asked whether the resolution comes from the Executive Committee and whether the Graduate Council will vote on it at the next meeting. M. Eichholz responded that it was voted on and unanimously passed by the Executive Committee and that it will be discussed at the next meeting.

**C. Hatziadoni** commented that he generally agrees with the resolution but he is concerned about recurring cuts in the colleges because his college stands to lose funds. B. Goodson clarified that the cuts are not recurring.

**Y. Lee** also voiced his agreement with the resolution since SIUC is a Tier 1 Research Institution.

### **Remarks – Faculty Senate Dr Whaley**

Reported that the Faculty Senate approved two resolutions; the first related to the definition of a credit hour. This is to bring SIUC in line with standard practices. The second resolution requests the President use the committee that was established for Speakers or not invite outside Speakers to the commencement.

### **Remarks – Deans Council Dr Wang**

Dr Wang reported that the Dean's Council met informally and would like to have a formula or criteria that will help budget reduction and help clarify why programs are cut or saved in the coming program review. He added that the budget cut was not an across the board cut and was not a performance based cut either. The only criterion was the affordability for each college. He also encouraged faculty to get involved in the program review and to participate in discussing non-academic program areas efficiency. He restated President Dunn's view that retrenchments in both the academic and non-academic areas are imminent.

### **Remarks – GPSC Report, A. Barnard**

Reported that both Dr Lee and Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Lori Stettler are abreast of how budget cuts will affect students. She also reported that

GPSC and undergrad students are planning a town hall meeting for late October and are hoping to invite State Legislators to come to campus and give their perspectives on the State budget. She also reminded the committee that GPSC provides funds to help students travel to conferences (up to \$150 to present, and \$75 if only attending). She also reported that Governor Rauner has appointed SIUC Student Trustee Allen Shelton with an official vote on the Board. This means students will have an official vote. She added that GPSC is making a \$50 charitable donation in memory of Crystal Marlow's husband. Crystal Marlow works in the Graduate School.

### **Nominations to Committees/Announcements – Council Vice Chair Goodson**

Traffic and Parking committee is seeking a proxy and looking for a volunteer. The University Joint Benefits Committee also requires a volunteer.

### **Standing Committee Reports**

#### **New Programs Committee Report, Professor Watts**

Currently reviewing two RMEs but have no resolutions.

#### **Programs Review Committee Report, Professor Velasco**

Professor Velasco read the **Graduate Council Resolution Recommending Approval of the Accreditation Review Process described in the Accreditation Review Overview Document** for the first time.

**J. Allen** commented that faculty has a lot of responsibility for the accreditation process. For example, faculty pay the dues of the accrediting bodies, site visits of the accreditation committee, writing their own self-studies that are presented to the reviewers, and for the follow-up. Faculty do not always get support from the Dean or the Provost office and there are cases in which faculty have expressed concern that they are not getting support. There are other faculty members engaged in the accreditation process and do not require help. The document provides an opportunity for faculty who want support or help from the Provost office in engaging in the accreditation process. He also noted that the language of the document may require revision since it sounds too legalistic; contrary to what was anticipated in an earlier meeting. The document can also be a source of structure that functions regardless of who is in charge and can facilitate and support what the faculty think they need. He also mentioned that, in the last five years, 10 programs have lost accreditation.

**B. Goodson** asked for clarity on the number of programs that have lost accreditation. **J. Allen** responded that there are 10 programs, five of which are graduate programs.

**M. Eichholz** stated that the resolution will be voted on at the next meeting.

**Research Committee**

Reported that the committee has been asked to revisit the tuition on grants policy, but has no resolutions.

**Education Policies Committee**

No report.

**Old Business**

B. Goodson asked about the post-doc policies, and M. Eichholz responded that he will check on the post-doc policies and the operating paper for the next meeting.

**New Business**

None.

**Adjournment at 10:12**