

# 2013-2014 GRADUATE COUNCIL

## Meeting Minutes

December 5, 2013

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. and proxies were read by the Chair, Carl Flowers.

### 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, Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, Christopher Lant, Derek Lehman (GPSC), Wanki Moon, Marc Morris, Prema Narayan, Ratna Sinha, John Stewart (GPSC), Margaret Sullivan (GPSC), Tomas Velasco and Alison Watts.

Members Absent: Katherine Frith, Susan Ford, James Garvey, James MacLean.

Ex-Officio members in attendance: Chancellor Rita Cheng, John Nicklow, Provost; James Allen, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs; Wayne Glass, OSPA

Proxies: Eric Lenz for Andrew Youpa, Michael Eichholz for Jim Garvey, Saran Donahoo for Kathy Hytten; Stacy Thompson for Grant Miller

Other attendees: Rachel Stocking, Matt Carroll

### 1. Minutes

Minutes from October 17 special meeting were tabled to give everyone a chance to review those. Randy Burnside made a motion to accept the minutes for Oct. 17<sup>th</sup> and Nov. 7<sup>th</sup> as presented, seconded by John Stewart. Minutes were approved. B. Crow brought up the fact that the time on the Oct. 17<sup>th</sup> minutes is wrong and it will be amended.

### 2. Remarks – Chancellor Rita Cheng

**Chancellor** reported that Commencement is planned for Sat., Dec. 14<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 p.m. Speaker will be Jim Rossiter, native of E. St. Louis, 3-degree alumnus of SIU, retired president of California State University at Los Angeles. Big news from Springfield is the pension bill, governor is expected to sign it when he gets it. The State University Presidents and Chancellors opposed the bill – expect it to be challenged in courts. Active fall recruitment events. New Student Service Building helping with retention efforts and other benefits. Encourage students to register for spring before leaving campus. Good news on grants – up compared to this time last year. \$28 million compared to \$25 million. Several grants were dispersed around campus, we should be proud of the work we are doing. Travel award endowment was announced to honor a late professor by her sons. We recently hosted a delegation from China's Northeast Normal University, acknowledging the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our partnership with them. That is a few of the highlights, many things going on – wish everyone well during winter break and holidays.

### 3. Remarks - Provost Nicklow

**Provost Nicklow** wanted to announce all the military honors received this month: 6 different awards within 6 weeks. Victory publishing named SIU Best for Vets; awards were received for Military Times, MMA Military Colleges and Universities, Public release – US News and World Report, received Above and Beyond award from US Dept. of Defense's Employer Support of the Guard; Governor's award for Excellence in Education. We take great pride in our service to the military and veterans. Enrollment has had some fluctuations, flat now in applications and admissions, fluctuations due to holiday and expect to be back up. Transfer Task Force has been put together, focus groups and are launching a targeted campaign at transfer students – statewide and regional. Spring is down considerably in some colleges. Masters up slightly, Doctoral down about 10%. Theresa Farnum, Retention Consultant came for assessment – positive comments about our initiatives and the structures in place. Gears are not connecting – need to identify weaknesses. She will be coming back for a retreat, Jan. 9-10<sup>th</sup>, the idea is to put together a comprehensive retention plan, targeting accommodations and strategies in colleges and retaining students. Lastly there are two Dean searches that have started, MCMA and Science. Applications are closed and committees have met. Goal is to identify short list in early spring, bringing in candidates early in semester.

#### **4. Remarks – Jim Garvey, Vice Chancellor for Research**

Not in attendance – no report.

#### **5. Remarks – Susan Ford, Graduate School Dean**

Not in attendance – no report.

#### **6. Remarks - Jim Allen, Associate Provost for Academic Programs**

**Dr. Allen** wanted to remind faculty of the final exam week policy. Students should not be taking any final exams this week. That is why we have final week. Please observe the final exam week policy, if you have any questions about it, let Dr. Allen know. Also book orders for summer and fall of next year are due Jan. 31<sup>st</sup> to ensure that we are in compliance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA). Chad Noll at Bookstore would be happy to help with EText Online and the savings it can provide to students. Dr. Allen and Sharon Walters have been meeting with Associates in colleges to work with developing college-wide assessment teams. This has been helpful to bring review and feedback, to the program level.

#### **7. Remarks – Chair Flowers**

**Dr. Flowers** asked the council how information from the Council meetings is being disseminated among departments and colleges. C. Hatziaioniu reported he has a blog, others communicate to Department during faculty meetings; take information to associate deans for disbursement. Since every department is not represented on the council, but every college is, is there a way to establish an information system to disseminate information. Flowers wondered if we could ask for volunteers to be responsible for taking notes or taking notes from the minutes and distributing the information among colleagues. We will talk about this more at next meeting.

Flowers attend the Nov. 12<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting, while at that meeting, John Warwick and Judy Marshall provided an overview on the 70/30 model used for this year's budget and they were asked to come to Grad Council to share the same information. Chancellor's budget meeting was cancelled due to holiday, next meeting is Dec. 18<sup>th</sup>.

Presidential Search Advisory Committee met on Nov. 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>. The meeting at SIUE on the 14<sup>th</sup> was an open forum held following the Board of Trustees meeting. The forum was held for the public to share thoughts and ideas about the new university president. The committee looked at the results of the surveys that had been completed, and met with Bill Funk, from Funk and Associates, the firm that has been chosen to help with the search. Next forum will be held on the Campus of SIU, Dec. 12<sup>th</sup> at 11:30 a.m. in the Student Center and Dr. Flowers encouraged everyone to attend. Goal is for the committee to narrow the pool down and have a short list by mid-February or so.

#### **8. Faculty Senate**

Faculty Senate's representative was not in attendance, Dr. Flowers gave a short report. The Faculty Senate is meeting Tuesday, Dec. 10<sup>th</sup>. The Executive Committee for Faculty Senate had a very spirited discussion concerning the RME of COEHS. The Faculty Senate Governance committee is working on revising the operating paper on the definition of faculty as it pertains to voting for Faculty Senate.

#### **9. Dean's Council**

**Dean Leonard** announced that the redesign of all the websites is taken place and they are not as up-to-date as possible. Right now the attention is to graduate recruiting so start looking at your graduate pages and make necessary changes.

#### **10. Nominations to Committees/Announcements – Professor Craig Anz**

**Dr. Anz** reported that the Mining Engineering Program Review needs one more appointee and meet tomorrow. Dr. Anz has volunteered if no one else has volunteered.

Announcements: Still meeting with the design task force on campus and trying to develop scenarios for a

synergetic relationship between Architecture and Design. Looking at how design plays a role in education, proactive approach to the world. The goal is develop relationships that can help grad funding, projects that involve interdisciplinary actions and efficiencies. If interested in presenting a proposal or an idea, Design Task Force is open to that.

## 11. Report of New Programs Committee

**Dr. Habib** reported that they received an RME for Fermentation Science. Habib presented the Grad Council Resolution ([attachment A](#)) for first reading. Dr. Flowers asked for comments and remarked that Matt Carroll was invited to speak to the Grad Council.

Some of the questions/points brought up for discussion:

1. How is 10-20 new students going to bring in revenues of \$600,000-\$1M annually? This is a per year assessment of revenue
2. Fermentation initiative exists, what the RME proposes is to give the Director a raise, money comes from Chancellor, Provost – has no plan on how to get there. What is the plan?
3. What is the difference between Center and Institute – which is it?
4. What is the timeline to get this done?
5. How much of a waiting list is there for the Program?

**Matt Carroll** responded. The program is not a department – but an Institute has 2 different parts – to foster developments but not restricted and to provide infrastructure to support and build programs. Fall of next year is when the institute is expected to implement the program. An institute is more of a physical entity, brick and mortar. After the RME is approved it has to go to the IBHE and that could be timely. Right now growth is timing and the time is now. Need to get going to standing position to have top 5 programs in the country and be viewed nationally. Dr. Allen suggested sharing the white paper with the council to provide more information.

Following discussions regarding wording on the resolution and Dr. Carroll's agreement to provide the Council with the White Paper for their review, it was agreed that the resolution would be brought back for 2nd reading and vote at the February meeting.

## 12. Report of Research Committee

**Dr. Davie** reported that the Research committee has been working on revising a resolution that was put forth at last meeting. Clarifications to the language used were made to make the objective clearer. Davie read the resolution for 2<sup>nd</sup> time.

**Dr. Flowers** asked for discussion. John Stewart asked if this resolution makes room for student representative on this committee. Davie said student representation was not intentionally left off and could certainly be added. Stewart made a motion to make a friendly amendment to the resolution to include student participation. N. Carver is still not clear why this committee is needed and what is going to be their charge. Carver talked with the Deputy Director of IT and he already has a committee and intends on still meeting with that committee. Carver wanted to know why the Deputy Dir. Is not on the committee. Davie said the faculty needs to be represented on research computing support. Dr. Flowers read a letter from Dr. Garvey, VCR stating that there does not need to be two committees for Research Computing. He will be serving as ex-officio on the IT committee. A discussion on the subject ended with the addition of Deputy Director G. Vania to the original research computing, along with student representation. The Resolution was voted on and was approved unanimously.

## 13. Report of Ed. Policies Committee

No report.

## 14. Report of Program Review Committee

**Dr. Moon** wanted to report a change in the Nov. 18-19 external review for Sociology because there was a conflict of interest in one of the reviewers. The review has been postponed until next year. Complications also existed with the fact that there was no chair in the department.

## 15. GPSC Report – John Stewart

**J. Stewart** reported that they are track with their budget. The issue of 75% appointments has not been resolved and/or dealt with. It is very frustrating for the GPSC members because those available for nomination are those that are not committed to a 50% assistantship prior to their nomination. Stewart was hoping for some clarification before the break and the beginning of the next semester. Flowers suggested Stewart call Susan Ford and discuss it with her when she returns.

**R. Ceresola** asked for clarifying information about the summer courses being dropped from a lack of tuition paying students. Grad students are concerned about classes being cancelled that they really need to take. Dean Leonard added that there will be a portfolio model used that will generate funds to pay for the courses. Colleges are using the portfolio model. Nicklow added that all the colleges are going with that because simply put "we would never make money" and never be able to pay for graduate courses period. So the deans are looking at subsidization of the graduate program with the undergraduate programs. This is a cost recovery model and it will be the dean's responsibility at their level. Balancing is different in each college, what works at one college may be different at another.

## **16. Report from Computing Advisory Committee – Norman Carver**

**N. Carver** attended the Computing Advisory Committee meeting and IT has finished their assessment of the computers on campus. There are about 4,000 computers on campus. They anticipate buying around 1,700 replacement computers this year over a 5-6 mo. period. This is where your IT fee goes and it is going forward. There will be a base model computer provided with fee and anything above the base model will have to be funded by the department. LAN Administrator will decide. The university is going to start being fined if, during a state audit, they cannot prove that the computers are being kept up-to-date. IT department is not forcing this but is being mandated by the state.

## **17. Old Business**

COEHS Reorganization: The Resolution was tabled at the last Graduate Council meeting. Marc Morris made a motion to bring forward the resolution for discussion, the motion was seconded by R. Habib. Motion approved. R. Habib made a motion to introduce an amended resolution from last time, and M. Morris seconded. The amended resolution was read. Dr. Flowers remarked that this resolution can be discussed and voted on at this meeting of Grad Council. Dean Wilson spoke to the Grad Council about the COEHS RME. He encouraged everyone to vote. Let's put this behind us and move forward as a college. Dr. Flowers urged the council to "do something" and make a decision. S. Donahoo wanted to know if the council received any additional information from the college as proposed at the last meeting when tabling the resolution. Dean Wilson is at the council meeting to provide any clarification needed. Discussion with grad council members pursued, many still concerned about the process that was followed to this point and nothing has been changed to fix the issues. Dr. Wilson addressed the issues. Ryan Ceresola made a motion to vote on the resolution, and was seconded. *The vote was taken – 7 for, 15 opposed and 1 abstention.*

## **18. New Business**

Dean John Warwick and Judy Marshall were invited to explain the model. Judy Marshall had to leave so Dean Warwick presented a short presentation on the 70/30 model used in the budget adjustment. In June of 2012, Chancellor requested that the committee look at budgeting models linking to performance funding at the same time the state appropriations were based on some performance factors they had developed. It was determined that FY13 was not going to have an increase in tuition revenues, but indeed was likely to have a shortfall. The committee was focusing on weighted factors, looking at new student head count at 30%, credit hours at 50%, and 20% on graduation rates. The idea was to use 10 day numbers compared to the previous fall. Tuition decrease in FY13 was about \$3.8 million. In October the committee submitted different scenarios to the Budget and Planning committee, and the committee recommended that we focus on headcount and credit hour generation at a 70/30 split, 70% on credit hour generation and 30% on new student headcount, new freshmen and transfers. That model was applied in FY13 to a total budget reduction of a little over \$1.1 million. In January of 2013, the subcommittee started discussion on the FY14 budget planning. The committee discussed using the same method as was used in FY13, units paid for their own salary increases; they would develop mitigating factors to reduce the overall reduction. They wanted it known early on that the same 70/30 model would be used, so that deans could plan for that and wouldn't be surprised. At the September 13 meeting, Dean Warwick presented the scenarios which he will explain. At the full meeting in October 13, the committee brought forth the actual numbers that were going to be used for this fall. (See

**Attachment B)** Dean Warwick explained that there were 3 different sheets to the spreadsheet, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> sheet was passed around. The first two sheets summarized what this model looked like for FY13. Warwick was not on the committee for FY13, he joined for FY14 planning. The model from FY13 worked, it distributed the shortfall of \$1.1 million in a reasonable manner. There were no huge negatives or positives. It then came time to use the same model for FY14; they were going to use same approach and same spreadsheet simply populated with new data. The output from that application of the model looked like COEHS down side would be a loss of \$9 million. The upside – the College of Engineering would have been up almost \$2 million. The subcommittee immediately looked at that and said that can't stand. It was the same model and it had the right data in the spreadsheet. Warwick pointed out that on the handout (**attachment**) the number 8 becomes a very important number. The fourth column is percentages, a percentage of what? In the FY13 model, the number instead of 8 it was a big number like 600 something. So the calculation that was made was all a percentage of the number that was circled – 8, not 600 something, so when they tried to apply the old model, everything in the 4<sup>th</sup> column, percent of change is getting divided by a very small number, and gets even smaller. As that number goes smaller, like to 1, the percentages explode. Number 8 was causing the numerical explosion of the winners and losers, and driving the spread to have massively big winners and massively big losers. So what the subcommittee decided to do, they wanted to remain true to the notion that they would use the same model and the same data. The things that changed – 1) how do we calculate these percentages, simplest fix was instead of calculating the percentage as the percentage of the net, recalculated them based on the percent of the total (3,929) and 2) the other change was normalizing the scores – the sum of the two weighted scores for each college, then divided by the sum of the averages. Some are positive and some are negative. A positive number means that there will be a reduction and if you have a negative number that will be an addition to the college, and then weighted scores are used to divide out the \$800,000 shortfall. There was no question that the old model couldn't stand, the debate was how could they make the fewest changes to method, keep the same data and have something that would be reasonable. That is all the changes made in FY14, 2 changes, one the way the percentages were calculated and the way that the normalized score was calculated.

- 19.** The motion was made by C. Hatziaodoniu to adjourn, seconded by R. Habib. The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 a.m.