

2013-2014 GRADUATE COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

November 7, 2013

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. by the Chair, Carl Flowers. Proxies were read by Graduate Dean Ford.

Roll Call

Members Present: Craig Anz, Amanda Barnard (GPSC), Randolph Burnside, Norman Carver, Ryan Ceresolo (GPSC), Scott Collins, Bryan Crow, Judith Davie, Carl Flowers, Chair Graduate Council, Boyd Goodson, Reza Habib, Constantine Hatziaioniu, Christopher Lant, Derek Lehman (GPSC), Grant Miller, Wanki Moon, Marc Morris, Prema Narayan, Andrew Pardieck, John Stewart (GPSC), Margaret Sullivan (GPSC), Tomas Velasco.

Ex-Officio members in attendance: Rita Cheng, Chancellor; John Nicklow, Provost; Susan M. Ford, Interim Dean Graduate School; James Allen, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs; James Garvey, Vice Chancellor for Research; Wayne Glass, OSPA

Proxies: Eric Lenz for Andrew Youpa, Michael Eichholz for Jim Garvey, Saran Donahoo for Kathy Hytten; Terry Clark for James Maclean

Other attendees: College of Education and Human Services Faculty, students

1. Minutes

Dr. Flowers announced that there were two sets of minutes sent out for approval at this meeting. Dr. Flowers made a change to the Oct. 3 minutes. John Stewart made a motion to accept the minutes as revised, seconded by Marc Morris. Minutes were approved as revised. Minutes from October 17 special meeting were tabled until next meeting to give everyone a chance to review those.

2. Remarks – Chancellor Cheng

Chancellor Cheng announced that since the last meeting there have been a number of international agreements signed. There is a wonderful agreement with the Hungarian American Commission and Nicholas Pinter to bring very talented graduate students to SIU. Cheng visited China during the month of October. We have existing MOUs and signed an additional MOU. Had great conversations with our partner universities about degree programs and expanding their relationship. What impressed Cheng the most was the number of alums throughout the world and in particular in institutions of higher education. These individuals are re-engaging with the university in helping us bring undergraduate and graduate students to SIU. Cheng encouraged everyone to stay connected to the Center for International Education. If anyone is traveling, and has the time to stop and spend an hour or so with the universities' contacts that would be helpful. The graduate school staff is very coordinated with their efforts with the Center for International Education and good things have happened. The Alumni Foundation Board was here for homecoming and we are engaged in conversation about launching a capital campaign. There is still a lot of work to be done before it becomes public. Homecoming was spectacular, Ragtime was a phenomenal performance in McLeod, Veteran's Appreciation Day was on Saturday, SIU won an Above and Beyond Award from the Illinois National Guard. Chancellor is working with the Provost on retention initiatives, and a consultant has been engaged to review all the retention initiatives to seek better outcomes and working with Vice Chancellor on various initiatives relevant to research and support. There have been several open houses, very good attendance and happy about that. We have launched a new effort to communicate across campus in the weekly announcements on Monday and Thursday to all faculty and staff with good news, events on campus and other need to know bits of information. The third floor has moved into the new Student Services Building, fourth floor is due to move-in in several weeks. The McLafferty Annex planning continues and getting ready for Phase I. Architects are here talking to the occupants of the communication building, exciting conversations around the renovation of that building and a significant addition. Pulliam and Wham construction is going along on schedule and they should be ready in August of 2014. Quigley basement will then be under slight renovation to make it habitable for architecture studios. That is expected to be ready by Winter 2014-15 and Spring of 2015. Sixth and seventh floor of library is expected to be complete by end of semester and open in January. Major gift announcement: Mr. and Mrs. Greenwood gave the university \$1.2 million for scholarships for students with disabilities who are interested in the STEM fields. Finally, they are working on this year and next year's budget planning. There will be a series of conversations with students about fees, we will look for varied planning around tuition and ask for appropriation dollars.

Questions for the Chancellor:

John Stewart asked the chancellor how she planned on getting student feedback on the fees. She answered; the staff goes to both the GPSC and the undergraduate with proposals and discussions. The units also have student advisory groups.

3. Remarks – Provost Nicklow

Provost followed up on Enrollment: they are working with retention consultants and having assessment done on all the different pieces. Recruitment right now is up, 9% increase in applications. That is the most applications that we have had for the fall. SIU again for the second year won the Higher Education Excellence in Diversity Award and Provost passed around the *Insight* Magazine ad. REACH application competition opens December 1st and closes February 1st, now is the time to get those in. There have been more visitors to the Center for Graduate Research and Creative Activities office on the first floor in the New Student Services Building, than we have had visit REACH and Rookies in the past. A lot of people walking by and getting engaged. Mid-term grading was opened up for the fall and 105 courses have used the mid-term grading, many are multi-section courses. Very successful and we will continue to do that. A follow-up on the Student Services Building, the graduate school has moved to the third floor and the building is open 8 – 5 pm and many student focus offices are remaining open until 5. They are contemplating staying open until 6, students say we evacuate at 4:30 pm, so they will look at that possibility. Cyberblocker virus has hit campus. Was targeted towards large research institutions, it locks down your computer and you can't access files unless you pay \$300 in ransom. Good news with that is 25 of 35 hits have been blocked, only 12 have been affected and none of those were on active directory. Those that migrated were caught.

Questions for the Provost:

Dr. Grant Miller asked for clarification on some of the issues that were referred to in the Faculty Senate with the bills that have been distributed to the colleges. Are they based on enrollment and some of the issues related to that? Nicklow answered that he mitigated as much as he could internally, what was distributed to colleges was the 2% salary increases for faculty and staff to be covered by the individual colleges. There was a model that was led by the Chancellor's Planning and Budget Committee which the grad council has a rep on that committee (Dr. Flowers) it is the same as it was last year, a 70/30 model, 70% is based on credit hours and 30% is based on head count, new student enrollment. The total revenue shortfall that had to be allocated was \$800,000, which worked out to be .9%. Miller stated minutes also noted the 90%/10% as far as faculty, who were lost, is that only if you retire, if you lose a faculty member and they go to a different institution that money is not kept. Nicklow confirmed that any vacated position; the college will retain 90% of that line for hiring and 10% goes back to Nicklow to use for strategic investments. Miller's final question was, the minutes from FS mention that the new formulas being explored, if the colleges are not giving back much in terms of tuition that might not look favorably upon their program. College of Education has a large number of student teachers and cooperating teachers that are given tuition waivers will that look unfavorably on that college then as a result of the new formula that is being explored. Cheng replied, if you are an undergraduate, they are taking the gross tuition less all waivers to get a net tuition and that is the number that is being distributed across campus. A lot of students are on different scholarships or waivers and they are not tracked by class. At the graduate level, there needs to be a discussion across the campus about the number of waivers and how we continue to have growth in the graduate areas and the number of waivers and how that is used as a strategy. The 70/30 model was based on the net number at the undergraduate level. At this time there is not a determination, we don't get a lot of tuition from the graduate programs on this campus. Cheng added that if you just go by credit hours in a growth mode the two colleges that deliver most of the core will get most of the money, so the professional schools would not get an early amount of resources so the 30% head count was put in to soften that and a way of making sure that the professional schools also got early credit for growth in enrollment. It does not include across college and interdisciplinary work because if you do that then you are looking at the trees instead of the forest.

Boyd Goodson asked the Provost if the 10% that is retained by his office, will go towards faculty hires? Nicklow answered it will only go towards faculty hires.

4. Remarks – Jim Garvey, Vice Chancellor for Research

Dr. Garvey spoke about a very successful Technology Expo at Dunn Richmond Center. This is a time to look at all the great things going on on campus relative to tech transfers that end in businesses or successful patents. Garvey encouraged everyone to go back to their colleagues and tell them that anything that has potential for export from this university, such as opportunities for corporate business that would be great. Inventor of the Year

was celebrated. Dr. David Lightfoot, College of Agriculture, made a lot of inventions and has been successful getting them out into the business world. Larry Cruz is alumni of Engineering program, works for Conair, the company that makes hairdryers, he is a patent lawyer, was a very dynamic speaker at the expo. Garvey remarked on the C-Grant program. It has been revamped and is not called the Collaborative Faculty C-Grant program. There was an interdisciplinary C-Grant program and the regular C- Grant program. Because indirect costs are down, and there is not as much IUC to spread around, they wanted to make it matter more, so the change was made to help foster interdisciplinary and collaborative interactions on campus and more mentoring of junior tenure track faculty. Applications should be up in a week or so and the due date will be early January, and money will be given out at the beginning of next fiscal year. Garvey can give out more information on this. Garvey attended a Grant Writers Council, created by continuing education, this is to bring the institutional grant writers together to work on grants that might not be in the realm of research but might involve research outreach. This group would love to work with the research active faculty but are not sure how to interact with the faculty; there are a lot of interesting grants that can be researched and by working with this Council, Garvey feels there is a real opportunity there. Travel funds program is being revised to better serve the faculty and be used more judiciously than it has been. College deans have been asked for their input and would like input from the Graduate Council as well, get that to Garvey by early next week. The VCR's office is committed to getting people to conferences and other collaborative efforts as much as possible.

Dr. Flowers asked Garvey about the possibility of there being less C-Grants but more dollars? Garvey replied that they are going to cap the C-Grant program at \$70,000, and the money will need to be used right away. More accountability and there will be proposals written for something. There will be fewer awards.

5. Remarks – Graduate Interim Dean Susan Ford

Dean Ford provided follow-up to Dr. Miller's tuition waiver question, it is an ongoing concern and ongoing conversation about how tuition waivers will affect distance ed courses for graduate students and summer course offerings for graduate students. Most graduate students are on waivers and it becomes difficult for the on-line courses and the summer courses to generate sufficient tuition to cover the faculty salaries. Some deans have already announced that if there is not enough tuition paying students they will cancel summer classes on day one, and students cannot be asked if they are on waivers. It is a legitimate concern and will be something that they will keep looking into so as not to have cancellations happen. Habib added the concern would be the 400 level courses that the grad students may take and those are cancelled then other grad students would suffer. Ford agreed, there is a concern and we don't want those things to happen. Nicklow added that common sense needs to be used and if they are courses that is absolutely required for continuation then this is not in the long term interest and the dean needs to balance that so the overall portfolio is a positive. Distance Ed model is now working to alleviate this, if you have a graduate program that is connected to an undergraduate program, you can be overenrolled in an undergraduate class and that will generate funds that would cover the costs of a graduate program. These are all things we need to pay attention to. N. Carver added that from a faculty prospective, I need a certain number of people to pay my salary, I don't want tuition waived students in my class then, because they don't count and they make me do more work. Ford said that is what she is hearing from some faculty. Carver added that is going to be a big problem. Dr. Flowers questioned, if it is a grad school policy that a grad student that is on a GA for the fall-spring semesters, are they automatically on one for the summer. Ford confirmed indeed they are, that is policy. Hatziaodoniu asked if there is any business to change that. Ford replied that is part of the union contract and would have to be taken up with them. Nicklow added that they are asking the deans to apply a lot more strategy to this, some deans are more risk adverse than others and are more willing to dive in. You can't have a lot of courses at the same time with a lot of waivers, it doesn't work. Every college is different and every dean is different but overall the portfolio has to work. Revenue has to be generated.

Ford continued that this is an ongoing issue and has the most impact on graduate education and it is something for the council to be aware of. D. Lehman asked where these conversations are happening and who is making these decisions? R. Cheng replied what is most important to the university is to know where the revenue is coming from. There is no flexibility in the Sept. through May budget to subsidize anything else so we have to be careful. It is a huge benefit at the campus that graduate students who are enrolled in the spring and fall get to take the summer courses, not every institution offers that for the same reasons because it is expensive to offer and you have to at least break even. These conversations are going on at the dean level, the program level and at the Planning and Budget Committee. Ford said it is a unique problem to the graduate program.

The deadline for depositing theses and dissertations was Nov. 8 and there are formatting guidelines. Ratna Sinha is in India and her trip is going great guns. Can't compare registrations for Spring 14 with registration for Spring

13 yet. Keep working on getting students registered. Probably too late for international students for Spring 14, better to look towards fall arrival date. Deadline for fellowship applications fall in January for masters and doctoral and February for comped, graduate deans, etc. Make decisions by early January. Programs are encouraged to have rolling admissions starting in January, Ford will meet with colleges to try to talk about best practices and answer questions. Council of Grad Schools released a recent study on attrition/retention in masters programs. In this study, two of the schools were from Illinois, SIUE and Loyola. The results have just been released and presented by SIUE graduate dean at the meeting. The results were very interesting and Ford could give a presentation next semester on why graduate student are leaving programs. Ford will not be present at the December meeting, she will be at the Council's Annual Meeting and the topic of discussion will be interdisciplinary programs and how to make them succeed on campus. Graduate School offices have moved to the new building – third floor.

Dr. Flowers asked about a new payment policy for the grad school application fee. Ford replied that the grad school has added the ability for the students to pay by credit card because it is the most convenient way to pay. So all payments will come to the graduate school by credit card, but they will still be able to pay by check or cash.

J. Stewart wondered if there was any update on the 75% policy. Ford said she has met with the union because of a cease or desist order, but at the time there nothing to cease or desist, but it was a good meeting and the big concern is how the Obama Affordable Care Act will affect the type and cost of healthcare provided to GAs. Continuing proactive steps to avoid any repeat of when the law changed effective to administrative assistantships which became taxable. Trying to avoid that by partnering with the union and trying to figure this out. She will let the council know as soon as a policy is adopted that will protect the students. The money is the same, the number of GAs is the same, there may be more students supported.

N. Carver asked about updates on the understanding with the Indian Universities in terms of tuition. His college has 250 MS applications for spring. Provost answered that they figured they would automatically be interested in renewing but they have had some personnel changes and have had to contact another person over there. New teams have been created and are working on it and having conversations. R. Sinha is making contacts while she is there.

6. Remarks – Jim Allen, Associate Provost for Academic Programs

Dr. Allen came back to a point that Dr. Ford had made earlier, about the approval process for new programs and modifications to programs, RMEs. It is astonishing to realize how slow this process is. As much as 18 mo. from initial development till appearing in the catalog and students can enroll. That is just unacceptable to them, the faculty, and to the institution and its well-being. There is much that should be done to expedite this process and service to our colleagues and their students. There is a spreadsheet on the Provost website that notes where the progress is for each and every program or RME. Dr. Allen is committed to find ways to see if we can't move the process along. Dr. Allen has been working closely with Dr. Ford, Dr. Flowers and some of the standing committees and IBHE associate director. We can blame the IBHE for half of the problem but that is no reason that we should delay because they are slow. If we get our paperwork in order before it goes to Springfield it will take less time for the review process. Dr. Allen will help with the development of these program changes, and monitor and dog each one until they are resolved. He would like to see it come down to a 2-month turn-around when it comes to a constituency group, but over the summer it is hard to do. Dr. Allen feels that helping programs to time their submissions will help them with the process. Also there are four grad programs that are being reviewed by review committees because of their IBHE metrics – these are the Masters of Engineering in Civil and Environmental and in Biomedical Engineering; MA – Speech Communication; and Masters in Mining Engineering. Dr. Allen has met with all but one committee, they have resolved one in Biomedical Engineering and hoping to work with the others to see that these programs are not at risk from IBHE taking unilateral action on the degree program. There needs to be a measure of control over that and the best way is to insure that they have the feedback they need. These are reviews done internally by the Program Review Changes Process that was approved in spring 2012 in grad council and faculty senate.

Dr. Miller asked if the CIPS numbers in the 2014 catalog would be corrected. Dr. Allen said yes they should be corrected right now on Office of Institutional Research and Studies webpage. The most current data is there on the quick facts page.

7. Remarks – Chair Flowers

Dr. Flowers attended the Chancellor's Planning and Budget committee meeting. Most of the information has already been discussed. The Presidential Search Advisory Committee was meeting Nov. 7, beginning in the morning. Everyone should have received an email with a link to a survey regarding the search for president. There are several meetings scheduled here on our campus as well as on SIUE campus to gather information from faculty, staff and students. Concerning the graduate tuition issue that has been discussed, he would like the Educational Policies Committee to look at that from a Graduate Council standpoint. He thinks it would be important for the Grad Council to have a voice in that.

8. Faculty Senate – Professor Terry Clark

Dr. Clark reported that the faculty senate had a somewhat heated conversation about the 70/30 model and they have invited Dean Warwick and Judy Marshal to the November meeting next week to blow the clouds away. They are going to explain the model clearly. Faculty Senate will be bringing the RME on COEHS to the floor of the Senate at the December meeting; UEPC is still working on that.

9. Dean's Council – No report

10. Nominations to Committees/Announcements – Professor Craig Anz

Dr. Anz reported that there are a few things outstanding on Committees. Mining Engineering Program Review needs one more appointee has had a lot of turn downs. If interested contact Dr. Anz or Dr. Allen. Anz has been asked to get GC reps for two committees, Early Career and Early Teaching Excellence Awards committees. One appointee is needed for each committee, Dr. Anz and Dr. Flowers thought it would be best suited for a Grad Council member. If interested in either of these committees contact Dr. Anz. Announcements: Design-across-the-curriculum initiative: they have been combining classes in architecture for better efficiencies and they are developing collaborative ways to get funding and grants, and innovation solutions to things. There are possibilities to create new programs. Several things they are looking at as a committee. If anyone is interested to have input on that let Dr. Anz know. Design Center has been created in downtown Carbondale. This is mainly architecture and how it relates to Chamber of Commerce and Main Street. Anz sees this broadening up to service learning models, economic development models, and community education. Anyone interested in that, this is similar to what they did in Alexander County, and we need to come up with models to help the decaying city of Carbondale. This has a direct correlation to enrollment at the college. Anz would like to see some more businesses come on board next semester.

11. Report of New Programs Committee

Professor Habib reported that they re-introduced the NUI in Radiologic Science in CASA which is for a Master of Science in Radiologic Science. Habib read the proposal again. (attached) Dr. Flowers said that was the motion, without any further discussion, the motion to accept the resolution was passed unanimously.

12. Report of Research Committee

Dr. Davie introduced a resolution that came out of the discussions by the council which called for a Research Computing Advisory committee to be formed. Davie read the resolution for introduction. Dr. Flowers asked for discussion. N. Carver mentioned that the VCR is not an expert in computing and should not be chair of a committee that is supposed to decide how computing infrastructure is supposed to be on campus and how money is to be spent on that – it seems highly questionable. He could not support something like that. Also what power does this committee have, do they have the final say on decisions that are made, do they just make suggestions and IT carries them out – just too vague. Dr. Flowers asked if he would support amendments to the resolution. Dr. Davie remarked she was a little confused because the VCR is an expert in the research aspect and the committee is the Research Computing Advisory Committee. Garvey has not had a voice, they just nominated him as chair. Hatziadoniu added that the CIO of IT will be a member of this committee to provide the technical expertise. Dr. Flowers added that the VCR would be there as an ex-officio member for advice and so would David Crain. Provost Nicklow remarked that it would be led by the Deputy Director for Research Computing, that individual does not make the decisions; the idea is to have the faculty bring suggestions to the leadership and administration so a collective decision can be made to support research on this campus. Hatziadoniu remarked that we need a first step in this committee and there needs to be a vision. Anz also said that one of the concerns that came up was that IT should be the one making the decisions. The clarification needs to be made that the committee is for research related infrastructure and how it relates. There was much discussion on this topic. Dr.

Davie said this was the first reading and the wording can be changed to reflect the need for faculty on the committee. Dr. Flowers suggested changing the wording and bring it back to the next meeting for the second reading and the council take action on it then.

13. Report of Ed. Policies Committee

Dr. Collins read the Tuition Waiver Scholarship Allocation Policy Resolution (attached) for the second time after making slight edits. M. Eichholz asked why the GPA was the limited criteria here? Collins replied, it was to keep it simple and based on manpower in the graduate school because they don't have the resources to do it. Dr. Ford added that these scholarships are given each semester so decisions have to be made fall, spring, summer. B. Goodson asked if these are for basic programs. Ford reiterated that these are just the general scholarships that are given out across campus to each college. Students that are offered a GA will usually take that over a Tuition Waiver Scholarship, so these usually go to students who did not get a GA or a Fellowship. There are only about 20 of these given out a semester. Then there are about ten given out to international students. Flowers asked for any other discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Report of Program Review Committee

Dr. Moon wanted to report one change in the scheduled reviews. Professional Science Masters in Fuels Management and Advanced Energies is one of the three programs to be reviewed. This program is to use only external reviewers because it does not have supporting personnel or director. This form of review is consistent with IBHE rules.

15. Report of Executive Committee – Professor Anz

The committee met in regard to the RME for the COEHS Reorganization on Oct. 17th. Anz read the RME for the second time. Dr. Flowers added there has been extensive discussion of this resolution. The council can have additional input here without redoing the meeting from Oct. 17th. One of the issues that came up was the question of why the dean was not at that meeting. Flowers asked the dean to come to the Grad Council meeting to make some comments.

Dr. Wilson began by apologizing for missing the Oct. 17th meeting, but he had two equally important meetings to attend and was at an ICE meeting. Dr. Wilson explained that he has been part of a reorganization before he came here, and some of what he's hearing is perfectly normal. Is the RME perfect – no! Many other rationales could have been included such as increase enrollment which is vital, new programs, new synergies within faculty; most important we need to do something different. This is a major attempt to do something different.

John Stewart, met with students from various schools and they talked about a variety of concerns. The students are concerned that TA and GA positions are going to be downsized when the RME occurs, the students feel that the RME is being rushed through and is too vague, they feel it lacks clarity, it can and will cause unforeseen problems in the future. The cost savings from this RME have not been justified because of the rushed nature. Counselor Ed does not have an enrollment problem; their numbers are as high as allowed by accreditation. They feel if enrollment grows then the faculty needs to grow as well. Concerned about how the independent programs are going to remain so after the RME, worried about visibility and identity within schools. Stewart hopes that all council members take these concerns into consideration when voting on this resolution today.

M. Eichholz asked why this is coming from the Executive Committee instead of Programs Committee, and then if we vote against the current resolution, what impact does that have? It is pretty apparent that change needs to happen in the college. One of our concerns is that there is inadequate detail in the RME, so if we ask for more detail before passing – will that set things back a year, two months or what?? Flowers answered Eichholz, and explained why the resolution was coming from the Executive Committee. The program committee kicked it back to the executive committee to send it back to the college for more information. The executive council, within its purview, wrote a resolution rather than sending it back to the college. It did not come from Dean Wilson, so it was not sent back to the college. In answer to the second question, Flowers did not have an answer about what would happen.

Saran Donahoo said the college had an obligation to provide details and at this time that has not been provided in the RME, the members want to know what they are signing and right now they don't. Flowers said there are certain elements that must be in the RME and they are there. They may not have every detail that other programs have requested. Dr. Wilson said when the concept paper was written over a year ago, he was responding to folks about the programmatic changes and even some of the grad students. As dean he doesn't see fit to micro-manage every department. The unit and the faculty should make some of those decisions – the

programmatic changes. Anz remarked that the groups are asking for clarifications. He also said he noticed that people were using terms like dissolved, removed, erased, identity and Anz doesn't read any of that in the RME.

Marc Morris explained he sees a lot of good in this resolution, but had a question about the TAs and grad assistant positions as well as the resources and he talked to Dr. Headrick about that. Dr. Headrick stood up to answer, no TAs are going to be lost, the CIPS Codes on the programs are the same.

Judith Green, Higher Education shared some of her concerns as a faculty in the COEHS department. When you start something in the wrong place it goes even further off course, and this is what has happened in the college of education. Faculty is hardworking, and making up for the intentional refusal to replace lost faculty, sometimes without pay. Spring of 2012 there was a departmental retreat to express concerns about leadership and other issues that faculty worked hard to address. Nothing happened, dean was not inclined to work with the chair, in fact they were told their department was going away, you can participate or allow it to be done to you. Green told the council that the SIU institution was held in high regard when it comes to placement of candidates that have been through the program, they are the first ones chosen for employment. The departments, at least Ed Admin and Higher Ed, is willing to come together to coordinate, talk about what things the students need and work to develop that. It just started wrong.

Hatziadoni commented that we have a college that needs to change, it started from the top and not from the roots, the leadership of the college were not able to bring the faculty together. He is concerned if the RME is passed, will it help or not help the college, so it is better to table the resolution. Go back and rework it. This is what the New Programs committee wanted from the start. Hatziadoni moved to table the resolution for now and let them have time to work it. Anz remarked that he agreed that taking a deep breath is good in this instance, but no action is not an option. Rethink this and then come back to the table.

Dr. Collins questioned, none of the programs are going away, they are just going to be housed in different departments? The degrees will still be offered to our students and to this region – correct? Dr. Ford clarified that degrees are approved by the Board of Higher Education and they have CIPS Codes, no programs go away without first being voted on by the university. Before the RME comes to the constituency groups, it goes through a series of reviews without a vote, when Dr. Ford reviewed the RME she looked only at the graduate programs, they remain unchanged, and graduate-GA lines are given to the deans to allocate as they wish, and those have not changed for several years, and there is no plan to do so. So as Dean she had no comment and then the RME came to the council. It does affect the people who administer those programs by reporting to different chairs, etc., but programs remain the same.

Dr. Dilley wanted to follow up on the notion of where the departments go, is visibility important? Dr. Allen told us this morning that faculty own these programs – these are your programs. This is not just about where degrees are housed. Programs can be eliminated if faculty vote to eliminate them. There would be 3 faculty going into a department with voting faculty of 12. Faculty who didn't want them to vote. Faculty who don't find our programs appealing. Programs don't cost money, people cost money and that is the ultimate goal of this restructuring if you look at the details provided. The savings is only going to come through the loss of faculty."

Dr. Wilson thanked the faculty for their comments, and encouraged the council to vote, he is ready to move on and the college is ready to move on.

Dr. Anz suggested that the RME be tabled just one more month, after Faculty Senate votes on it, give it some time, get input from the Senate and in the meantime, have the college really look at how they could work with the faculty members on its own.

Dr. Miller added one thing that would be helpful, we are currently faced with our bill of \$729,000 in a permanent cut, on top of a \$1.2 million cut last year, may be a good time to communicate to the faculty, how the college will be moving forward with those permanent cuts to the college and how this potential RME could benefit the college. What would be the vision? This could be the only benefit of tabling this RME, to see how the restructuring could further benefit, support or sustain the college based on the realities.

Dr. Flowers said there is a motion on the floor to table the resolution, by Hatziadoni, seconded by Anz. 25 for tabling the resolution and 1 opposed. Motion passed.

16. GPSC Report – John Stewart

J. Stewart asked about email with agenda and minutes, Flowers noted that it was posted on the Grad Council

website, and during the move to the new building there were some email problems. Stewart expressed appreciation to the Dean for her attention to the 75% issue. Also wanted to share the concern from the GPSC on how this will affect the GC positions. These positions are filled on the electoral process based on the voice of the graduate students. Those available for nomination are those that are not committed to a 50% assistantship prior to their nomination. Stewart asked how they would deal with that issue and to take that into consideration.

17. Old Business

There was no old business.

18. New Business

There was no new business.

The motion was made to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 10:24 a.m.