

2016 GRADUATE COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

October 6, 2016

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:04am.

Members Present: Sue Rimmer, Constantine Hatziaodoniu, Norman Carver, Wesley Calvert, Lahiri Sajal, Ras Michael Brown, Trish McCubbin, Dianah McGreehan, Sheena Hart, Justin Simpson, Jonathan Howard, Johnathan Flowers, Zhao Wanli, Cinzia Padovani, Joseph Shapiro, Richard McKinnies, Julie Partridge, Rachel Whaley, Jennifer Smith, Ratna Sinha, Tomas Velasco, Howard Motyl, Paula (Roa) Basler, Buffy Ellsworth.

Members Absent: Greg Rose, Cynthia Sims, Richard Bradley, Clay Nielsen, Kenneth Stickers.

Proxies: Saran Donahoo for Cynthia Sims, John Groninger for Clay Nielsen, Robert Hahn for Kenneth Stickers.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Yueh-Ting Lee, Meera Komarraju, Susan Ford, James Allen, James Garvey.

Ex-Officio Members Absent: Randy Dunn, Brad Colwell.

Consideration of minutes

The minutes of the September meeting were passed with friendly amendments:

- J. Partridge stated that L. Sajal did not volunteer to serve on the Honorary Degree and Distinguished Service Award Committee.
- Dean Lee corrected the enrollment number noted as 3310 to 3130. He also moved a sentence from the end of the report to the second paragraph of his report.
- T. Velasco also read an email from Dr Lilalla amending comments he had made during the September meeting regarding the search for the Interim Dean of MCMA. The correct information is that the approach taken for the ongoing search is consistent to that followed in the 2012 search for an Interim Dean of MCMA.

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes with the friendly amendments – 23 voted in favor.

Remarks – Acting Provost, Dr Ford

Provost Ford started by welcoming new Graduate Council members.

Speaking about the budget, Dr Ford said that the university must continue to conserve cash to cover payroll and that there are a lot of things that have to be put on hold until the State provides a substantial stop gap funding. She mentioned that The Board of Trustees and many other people on campus have recognized that one of the largest deficits to the university's attempts to recruit students will be fixing *The Towers*. She explained that *The Towers* are dilapidated and that plumbing needs to be repaired regularly. The plan to replace the building with 21st century student living has been in place for several years. Provost Ford also explained that the building will not be paid for out of funds that could have been used to hire faculty. The funds will be drawn from auxiliary money that comes in through housing receipts and bond payments – money that can only be used for housing or not at all. She also mentioned that it will take approximately 12 years to complete the replacement of the towers, an indication that the university will not be closing down.

The Provost also reported that the budget crisis in Illinois impacted enrollment numbers and complicates recruitment efforts. She mentioned that many prospective and freshmen students went to universities outside of the State because of concern about the stability of higher education in Illinois. She explained that a large number of students who applied to SIU and did not come went to Illinois State and the University of Illinois because the University of Illinois has lowered the required ACT scores while Illinois State lowered ACT scores and the level at which they offer merit scholarship to incoming students.

Provost Ford also stated that SIU has to look internally since the university is at a 25 year trend of decreasing enrollment although SIU offers one of the best quality educations nationally. She noted that SIU's reputation in the State has fallen for a variety of factors outside of faculty's control and that together with the Chancellor she is working to reverse the factors that have contributed to the decline in SIU reputation.

C. Hatziaodoniu asked about the capacity of the new housing structure to be built. Provost Ford responded that she does not have the exact figures.

L. Sajal asked about the rent students pay, whether there is a deficit and since the buildings come with a flow of income, whether the university can borrow against those costs. Provost Ford responded that the rent goes to housing to help pay for maintenance, residents assistance and other various housing costs. She also said that she does not believe that there is a deficit because housing cannot operate at a deficit. The cost of maintaining *The Towers* is substantial, which means that most of the money goes back into maintenance. Dr Ford explained that housing has a different bond rating than the university as a whole and operates differently. She made an example of SIUE, explaining that when SIUE built their first dorms in the 1990s they were able to borrow against the housing stock of the system, which allowed them to get a better rate. She also explained that there are two funding models for housing. The first involves the university funding and owning the building and the second is the Public Private Partnership (PPP) arrangement. Different universities have followed different models and SIU accountants have found that the PPP arrangement does not serve universities well in the long term. Dr Garvey also added that consultants hired by SIU advised that it is better to fund the housing internally.

C. Padovani asked Dr Ford to explain what she means by a 21st century living environment and whether there are plans to install solar panels. Dr Ford explained that the plans she has seen include fewer people in a single building, more open spaces for interaction, plumbing that is easier to maintain and bathrooms that are user-friendly but is not sure about the solar panels. Part of the difficulty with *The Towers* is that too many people are crammed into a single building. Dr Garvey also added that the solar panels is a great idea and there are several ways to get funding for solar panels outside the university and advised that a suggestion can be made to the Board of Trustees to work with the Sustainability Group on campus to search for support for such ideas.

Completing her report on enrollment Provost Ford mentioned that SIU missed the Fall enrollment target by 13 students. There were 15, 987 students by the 10th day count. However, after the 10th day count, 65 additional students registered, which means SIU has over 16 000 students. Provost Ford also spoke about ACT scores. She also stated that the university has continued with its efforts to increase the number of college ready students, and that based on the ACT scores measure, the ACT average for incoming students has gone up. SIU has been on a general upward trend for the past five years. For the Fall cohort, SIU is now at an average ACT score of 22.253, the highest in a very long time. This

suggests that the university has many more college ready students who can graduate in four years. She stated that the funding model was shifted so that the university provides more support to students in the critical 21-27 ACT band. Regarding the profile of incoming freshmen class, she stated that the percent of students who fall in that critical band is up while the percent of students who are in the 28 and higher is relatively stable. Although the overall enrollment is down, the profile of the incoming class is in line with the target indicating that SIU is achieving the goal of having more college ready students.

Regarding retention efforts, Dr Ford reported that in August *Degree Works* was launched and the program provides an easy interaction for students and advisors to track degree progress.

L. Sajal asked Provost Ford to give the Council a sense of when enrollments is projected to start rising. Provost Ford responded that during his State of University address, the Chancellor gave a target for a 10 percent increase in incoming classes in two years. She added that the budget crisis makes it hard to plan although the new Director of Admissions has made a lot of changes in terms of how SIU interacts with potential students. Provost Ford also explained that retention numbers of the freshmen class fell from 68 percent to 64.5 percent despite efforts to increase the number to over 70 percent. She added that retention of sophomores to juniors and juniors to seniors went up so much that the overall retention rate is up slightly from 74.7 percent to 75.4 percent from the year before.

L. Sajal commented that retention can go up if students are taking longer to complete their studies. Dr Ford responded that she does not have detailed information about students taking longer than four years to complete but is aware that SIU is doing better in getting students to graduate in four years.

C. Hatziadoniu asked Provost Ford to comment on university leadership, whether the Provost thought that the Chancellor and the President provide effective leadership. Provost Ford felt that it would be inappropriate for her to comment. However, she stated that she is trying her hardest in her own part to give smart and informed leadership as Provost.

J. Allen added that there is a quarterly review and everyone has received a survey. The survey is a chance to answer the question about leadership. He said that it is important that the Board of Trustees hear from the SIUC community an opportunity to express evaluation. We have a proxy evaluation of the Chancellor. We are conducting a search this academic year for a permanent Chancellor. There is a search committee being assembled and an opportunity to rate the Chancellor's work in the last year in the context of the candidates who will be on campus. That is another participation of faculty to weigh in about the leadership of the university. The outcome for the search of the new Chancellor will determine (**me: maybe indicate**) what the university community thinks.

H. Motyl commented that Judy Davies has sent out a different survey to evaluate President Dunn, separate from the one that is online. She has only received four responses.

C. Padovani asked whether Provost Ford knows who will be the Interim Dean of MCMA. Provost Ford responded that the search is ongoing and an update to faculty and staff will be sent (that same day) to update them on the search process. No conclusion has been reached.

Remarks – Interim Vice-Chancellor for Research, Dr Garvey

Announced that his office has issued a request for five page proposals for the use of the *McLafferty Annex*. The building is about 65 thousand square feet and is currently being used

by various departments. However, not all the space is fully utilized. The idea is for the building to continue to be interdisciplinary for people to work together on collaborative projects. The request for proposals is intended to get groups of faculty, students and staff interested in using the space to come up with ideas about how to use the space. The proposals will be reviewed by three independent reviewers and the Vice Chancellor will select the top project based on the recommendations of the reviewers. There will be information meetings and tours on Tuesday, October 25 and the request for proposals closes on November 30, 2016.

C. Hatziaioniu asked if the space is for rent and how much space is available. Dr Garvey responded that the space is available at no cost to the faculty and there about 45 to 50 thousand square feet amount of space available. The main cost would be putting up walls. The idea is to use the space in ways that enhance funding opportunities and leads to student retention. He also explained that the request for proposals is open to all colleges and will encourage faculty to search for grants. Provost Ford added that that building was once refitted and used when the library was being redone.

Dr Garvey also reported that the university has \$76 million in research funding.

Y. Lee asked Dr Garvey to comment about Activity Insight. Dr Garvey explained that SIUC is on its second year of using *Activity Insight*, a reporting structure for faculty to report their research activity. He explained that he had talked to the Deans and that faculty members are being asked to load their 2016 calendar year data by May 1 2017. He added that there is an option to complete the blanks in *Activity Insight* or to have the information in a *Word* document and have someone collate the information. He also mentioned that his office is the process of determining the specific fields to be completed and faculty will be advised of which fields to complete.

B. Ellsworth asked whether there are plans for the school of medicine to have access to *Activity Insight*. Dr Garvey responded that that was not budgeted in and the School of Medicine had been asked if they wanted in and chose not to. Dr Garvey also mentioned that once the School of Medicine has a new Research Provost, the issue of *Activity Insight* will be discussed.

Remarks – Graduate School, Dean Lee

Reported that graduate enrollment has dropped significantly in comparison to the previous years. At the 10-day count, there were 3,183 graduate students, which means that enrollment is down by about 400 graduate students (a 14 percent decline). In addition, there are 1,215 assistantships and fellowships compared to about 1,700 the previous year.

The Graduate School has been given a target of increasing enrollment by 10 percent. To this end, the Graduate School is working closely with the graduate enrollment task force and the international recruitment committee and colleges/programs to focus on increasing the enrollment of masters-level tuition-paying students by 200. The Graduate School has also been actively going to graduate fairs in the region. Over 100 students have expressed interest in SIU graduate programs.

He also announced that on October 27, the Graduate School with the Career Services office will co-sponsor an on-campus graduate fair. Approximately 50 recruiting units (25 different universities and 25 SIU departments) have registered for the fair.

Dr Lee also reported that in September, SIUC and SIUE materialized a joint/cooperative Ph.D. program in Environmental Resources and Policy. He thanked everybody who worked hard to ensure that the program is realized.

He also reported about the two diversity initiatives on which the Graduate School will embark in the current academic year. One is that the next edition of *Graduate Saluki Stories* will focus on diversity and graduate education excellence. The other is the diversity training - the Graduate School will offer a training session and workshop on PROMPT/Grad Dean Fellowships to all students and Graduate chairs and directors to help in proactive recruitment of multicultural professionals for tomorrow (PROMPT). There will also be workshops to train new graduate directors and new chairs on October 18 and 19. The training will cover various policies and practices involving graduate admission, financial assistantships/fellowships, registration/records and degree completion.

J. Smith asked whether there was a memo circulated about the process to follow when transferring undergraduate courses to graduate courses in relation to accelerated MA programs. Dr Lee responded that inconsistencies were noticed in the accelerated programs, an issue that was brought to the attention of the Education Policy Committee. Dr Ford added that the undergraduate transcript must show at least 120 credit hours for a student to graduate. She added that on the masters level there is more flexibility and that up to nine (9) credit hours can be double-counted. She explained that students should pre-identify the classes that they wish to double count toward the Masters Degree and once such students are in the accelerated Masters Program, the department should communicate with the graduate registrar in the graduate school so that copies of such students' plans are filed. She added that because of the double counting, the graduate transcript will show a lower number of hours.

J. Smith asked whether pre-identifying courses to be double-counted should happen when the student is still an undergraduate. Dr Lee responded that the student should pre-identify the courses once admitted into the graduate program and the graduate school will make a note in *Banner* about the nine (9) credit hours.

N. Carver commented that the proposal was withdrawn and that the committee was not told to start discussing it again. Dr Lee stated that the first proposal was withdrawn but that there is a second proposal, which he undertook to send to Dr Carver.

Remarks – Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Dr Allen

Dr Allen reserved his remarks for the discussion on the Joint Task Force on Prioritization.

Report – Council Chair, Professor Velasco

Handed over to the Chair of the Joint Task Force, Dr Eichholz to present the final draft of the report.

M. Eichholz explained that that group was divided into three sub-committees, the quantitative, qualitative and the sub-committee on the identification of characteristics unique to SIUC. He explained that the quantitative sub-committee was tasked with identifying criteria based on numerical data collected for each program. The qualitative and "Uniqueness" sub-committees joined later on and worked on identifying criteria that could help evaluate the quality of a program based on attributes/uniqueness of a program.

The scoring for the quantitative criteria would be based on a standardized Normal distribution (Mean=0, Standard Deviation=1) in which the result of the application of each criterion to a Program will be determined based on 1 standard deviation. For the qualitative criteria the scoring would be based on a subjective score based on data drawn from a questionnaire to be sent out to Chairs and Directors of departments. Based on the results of the questionnaire it will be up to the Provost Office to determine the score. The scoring system for both the quantitative and qualitative criteria using one standard deviation as the measure to rank programs means that criteria above 1 standard deviation would be

qualified as "exceeding expectations", criteria between +1 and -1 standard deviations would be graded as "meeting expectations", and criteria below -1 standard deviations would be graded as "below expectations". There will be a limit to the amount of text that can be included in the questionnaire sent to each Department about Qualitative criteria to ensure that information provided to the Provost is manageable.

Dr Eichholz also explained that a vote was taken on who should approve the final report and the Joint Task Force voted 22 in favor, 2 abstaining (non-academic prioritization should have come before the academic prioritization) and 1 opposed (felt that the groups were not given enough time to provide input on the report). The Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council would then do a resolution supporting the report and or communicating concerns about the report.

Weighting: 46 percent of the criteria are what the IBHE would be interested in. These are: external demand (11 percent); financial efficiency (15 percent); internal demand (12 percent); and student success (8 percent). A larger percentage of the weighting (54 percent) goes on criteria that are not related to what the IBHE considers important. Examples include support for higher performing faculty and students; maintain program diversity, contribution to the region and others.

He also mentioned concerns the committee shared which include the unavailability of data necessary to conduct the prioritization process. For this reason, the Joint Task Force believes that the report should not be used as a basis for short or long term program prioritization or modifications until all data for criteria identified in the report are available.

Testing: Some testing will need to take place before this the model is used on a wide scale. The Joint Task Force had hoped to do the testing could not get enough data from 10 to 15 departments. The testing is to ensure that the model is performing correctly.

R. Whaley asked why there is a distinction between primary and secondary majors, whether the IBHE devalues second majors and if internally the university should also be devaluing second majors. Provost Ford responded that the university reports based on the way the State captures data. Students are counted as a major in the field in which they first declared their major unless they have transferred out of that major. She also said that the IBHE does not count second majors although the university considers second majors to be equally important.

T. Velasco added that the committee decided on the differentiation between majors because of the IBHE criteria.

M. Eichholz stated that it is too late to make changes to the report but concerns about counting majors equally can still be communicated to the Provost Office. He also explained that one of the difficulties was identifying how to compare research and creative activity among programs. A decision was made that the bar for each program will be based on the last five people in the program that received tenure.

T. Velasco stated that in the November meeting there will be a resolution on which the Council can vote.

J. Allen thanked Dr Eichholz and all the members of the Joint Task Force for their work especially since the report received consensus within the Joint Task Force. He added that the report will provide good cover for the IBHE's metrics of judging programs. The report also provides an opportunity for the university to support programs that are excellent,

identify programs the university can no longer afford to keep and those that should be reviewed and discussed in different constituency groups.

Report – Deans Council, Dr Komarraju

Dr Komarraju reported that Deans will encourage faculty to seek grants, collaborate with other faculty members and write graduate students in their grants so as to provide more assistantships. She mentioned that there are departments that actively seek graduate assistant opportunities from organizations in the community by placing graduate students with certain agencies that can pay students a stipend.

She also stated that because of the budget situation Deans are using a number of approaches to mitigate the funding decline. Some of the approaches include prioritizing support to new graduate students over those who have been in graduate programs for some time. She also added that since colleges have been losing faculty and NTT staff, the gap that is emerging in terms of teaching needs is being filled by giving priority to GA contracts for TAs rather than RAs. She also explained that more emphasis is being placed on graduate programs that can generate fees by attracting fee paying students.

Dr Komarraju also reported that Deans are looking at efficiencies such as sharing resources across departments. An example is by sharing the offering of classes (such as a methods class) such that each department does not have to offer each class every semester and can share the offerings with other departments so as to increase efficiency and allow faculty to offer other courses. Deans are also encouraging colleges to strengthen the interdisciplinary nature of education by accepting graduate courses taken in other colleges, as substitutes for courses that cannot be offered due to loss of faculty.

She reported that Deans are considering reaching out to graduate alumni to see if they are willing to provide donations to fund travel for current graduate students, an initiative with potential for long lasting travel fund generation, mentorship and networking results.

S. Ford commented that the budget cuts taken in the previous and current fiscal years are being treated as one time cuts rather than permanent cuts. As SIU reaches out to other sources for support in this time of crises those sources may have to continue in the long term.

J. Howard commented that a story in the *Daily Egyptian* mentioned further cuts amounting to millions of dollars. Dr Ford responded that she had not seen the newspaper but that could be another one time cut that can be taken from any source of funds and that would happen only if the university does not get additional funds from the State for this fiscal year.

L. Sajal commented that GA assistantships have been cut by about 30 percent and that another cut would decimate Ph.D. programs. Dr Ford responded that on average the cut came to about 25 percent, which is consistent with the target the Chancellor gave. She also explained that the percentage varies per college.

Report – Faculty Senate, Professor Motyl

Encouraged Council members to respond to the questions sent out soliciting opinions about President Dunn's performance by October 14 2016.

He also announced that on October 25 there will be a Fall Faculty Coffee bar and the Chancellor is expected to attend.

GPSC Report, J. Flowers

Reported that GPSC hosted a Town Hall Meeting with State Senator Pat McQuire where students put questions to the Senator. He also reported that the GPSC Committee on Diversity and Inclusivity policy met resulting in the two resolutions dealing with issues of diversity that were sent out to Council members. GPSC also sent a letter to the Chair of the Diversity Council requesting a student co-chair in the Council. The letter is presumed to be with Chancellor Colwell for his consideration. In the letter GPSC also expresses confusion and is seeking clarification.

J. Flowers also did a second reading of a **Graduate Council Resolution on the Importance of student involvement in Diversity Policy**

N. Carver raised concerns about the phrasing, "worsening climate of racism and tolerance" in the resolution. He stated that he is concerned about the message the phrase communicates and also does not believe that the statement is true. He asked whether the climate of racism is really worsening or whether it is just continuing as it has in the past. J. Flowers responded that during the previous semester a large portion of the student body joined the protest and there are continued acts of micro aggression in public spaces indicating that the climate of racism is worsening.

The discussion continued with N. Carver stating that there is a difference between claiming that something exists and that it is worsening. He added that compared to other universities he does not see SIU as worse and is concerned that the Graduate Council would assert that the climate of racism on campus is worsening. J. Flowers stated that if the Council wants him to change the phrasing he will.

W. Calvert commented that it is possible for the situation to get worse by staying the same.

R. Whaley commented that there should be caution in using words such as worsening and increasing when there is no data. J. Flowers responded that the information is available but no one has ever asked.

M. Komarraju asked whether the resolution reflects the views of the majority of graduate students. J. Flowers responded that the resolution was discussed by the executive members of GPSC and the GPSC Committee on Diversity and Inclusivity and that GPSC represents the interests of graduate students.

M. Komarraju commented that she is interested in numbers, in how many of the 3000 graduate students hold the view about the climate of racism. Flowers responded the 3000 graduate students rely on the position of their elected representatives charged with that responsibility.

M. Komarraju wanted to know the percentage of graduate students. J. Flowers responded that he does not have the information at hand but could get it for the Council. M. Komarraju responded that it would be helpful to know the percentages so as to understand whose view is represented in the resolution. She asked for information on representatives GPSC has, how may participate in meetings how many show up for meetings, and how many hold the view stated in the resolution about racism.

L. Sajal commented that some of the requests are unfair since members of the Graduate Council themselves represent and make decisions on behalf of graduate faculty and do not

consult faculty members in their respective departments about every decision made in the Council.

The issue was discussed further and M. Komarraju continued to raise the issue of numbers and wanted to know how many representatives had the view made in the resolution and L. Sajal explaining that GPSC are elected representatives. J. Flowers also explained that when the item was discussed at the GPSC meeting all 36 representatives were present to which M. Komarraju added that the notion of racism is a view of 36 people. J. Flowers stressed that the representatives are elected and represent graduate students and professionals.

B. Ellsworth suggested that the phrasing be changed so that it makes a positive rather than a negative statement. J. Flowers stated that if the approval of the resolution by the Graduate Council depends on changing the phrasing he will change it since he is seeking for the gesture of the Council to approve the statement. He added that if changed and approved, the Council will be approving a statement that is not consistent with the general perception of both the graduate and undergraduate student body. Words such as 'challenging' and 'changing' were suggested as replacement for the word 'worsening'. J. Flowers restated that if the approval of the resolution is contingent on changing the wording such that it does not reflect the worsening climate of racism and intolerance he may be willing to change it since the symbolic gesture of faculty supporting the resolution is more crucial. He added that such a decision is not in keeping with the general perception of the students that Graduate Council members mentor and supposedly care for and who elected him.

W. Calvert moved that the resolution be amended by striking out the word worsening and

N. Carver seconded the motion.

J. Flowers accepted under protest.

B. Ellsworth proposed amending the resolution such that it reads - proactive rather than reactive toward improving the climate of racism...

L. Sajal seconded the proposal.

J. Flowers accepted under protest.

The resolution was reworded to read – proactive rather than reactive to the climate of racism...

The Chair called for a vote on the amended resolution. The Council members voted – 20 in favor, 0 abstained, and 0 opposed.

First Reading: Resolution in support of the creation of the position of coordinator of the Diversity Advisement, Recruitment and Fellowship at the Graduate School

S. Ford commented that she agrees with the resolution and clarified that since the position went vacant in 2012 numerous attempts have been made to have the position filled.

L. Sajal asked whether there is another way of filling in the position without hiring a new administrator. Provost Ford explained that between 2010 and 2012 there has been a loss of four full time positions in Graduate School.

Y. Lee also added that he has been to UIUC campus and diversity office has six staff members.

W. Zhao mentioned a typo in the heading of the resolution and also asked if J. Flowers had intended to include undergraduate students. J. Flowers responded that he intentionally included undergraduate students because internal recruitment would be a way that the office might engage in if the representatives of undergraduate students are unaware of the available support services then it would be the responsibility of this position to inform them.

T. Velasco also pointed out the misspelling of the word 'recruitment' in the heading.

First reading: Resolution for the creation of a Graduate Council Ad-Hoc Committee on faculty training and mentoring

No comments.

**Nominations to Committees/Announcements – Council Vice Chair, Dr Partridge
Standing Committee Reports**

All committees have been filled up.

New Programs Committee Report – Professor McKinnies

First Reading: Graduate Council Resolution in support of the Addition of a Professional Science Masters Degree Track in Wildlife Administration and Management

Started by stating that the majority of the committee members expressed concerns about the RME and do not support it as it stands because it is not cost neutral and there were issues with the clinical site assignments. However, the RME was supported by the Provost and the COS Dean and it followed all of the procedural processes.

J. Howard asked whether the department has letters of support from organizations promising to provide students with internships. M. Eichholz responded that the department does not have a signed memorandum of understanding and cannot have one signed until they have a program to sign it to. He added that he has requests to provide interns.

The issue was discussed at length with J. Howard asking most of the questions about the projected number of students, whether students have requested or shown interest in the program, how the program is different from others in the college, whether students would be guaranteed internships and placement after degree completion since they would have invested in the program and would not have received any GA assistantships.

J. Groninger also raised concerns about the program and said that there should be better coordination between the departments because the proposed program is likely to create confusion.

M. Eichholz responded that students would be marketable since they would have gained real experience in the program and the internship. He also stated that he has received letters from organizations expressing a need for students trained in the program. Dr Eichholz also explained that the program is different from all the programs currently offered and that at least four students have shown interest in the program. He expressed frustration at the concerns raised since he had requested the department of forestry to participate in meetings.

S. Ford commented that PSM has always had a director in line with the national model. She also explained that the degree would be a non-thesis option and that it is unique and separate from all existing programs.

First Reading: Graduate Council Resolution in Support of the Addition of an Undergraduate and Graduate Masters Accelerated Entry Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice

R. Sinha asked whether the MA degree would be a non-thesis option.

T. Kochel and J. Schafer responded that the MA degree would be a non-thesis option and that students would work on a research paper that would be submitted to the graduate school.

First Reading: Graduate Council Resolution in Support of the Addition of a Joint Masters Degree in Higher Education with a Juris Degree

R. Whaley asked how the program is different from existing ones, whether it will have the same or different code and why there is a need for accelerated degree programs. Provost Ford responded that it is the same degree and has the same code but is a different way of getting at the degree.

J. Allen also added that counting occurs at degree level and not at code level.

J. Smith asked whether the degree would be counted twice. Provost Ford responded that they count once in the program.

Program Review Committee Report, Dr Rimmer

No report.

Research Committee Report, Dr Lahiri

No report

Education Policies Committee Report, Dr Carver

No report.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15