SIUE Faculty Senate Curriculum Council
Magnolia Room, Morris University Center
January 16, 2020 – 2:30 p.m.

Minutes

Members Present: Faith Liebl (Chair), Jane Barrow, Robert Bitter, Kathryn Brady, Heidy Carruthers, Michelle Cathorall, John Foster, Keith Hecht, Chaya Gopalan, Erik Krag, Brad Reed, Geoff Schmidt, and Nima Lotfi Yagin.

Student Senate Members Present: Ronald Akpan and Sabrina Chau

Ex-Officio Members Present: Maureen Bell-Werner, Mary Ettling, Effie Hortis, Elza Ibrosoeva, Chris Leopold

Guests: Jennifer Rehg, Jason Yu, Julie Zimmerman

Absent: Ken Moffett, Eric Ruckh, Chad Verbais, Eric Voss

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the committee, Faith Liebl, at 2:30 PM.
2. Program Review: Anthropology. Guests: CAS Associate Dean Jen Rehg; Department Chair, Julie Zimmerman; and Program Review Team Chair, Jason Yu.
   a. Program Review Team report (Jason Yu summarized report provided previously to council members)
      i. Rating: Program Review Chair indicated they were impressed with the program and indicated that the program has performed remarkably well especially given the limited resources they currently have. The program is very student centered, with positive, individualized faculty mentoring and many opportunities for experiential learning. The Notable Merit rating suggested by the review team results from a few areas in which recommendations for improvement were noted.
      ii. 5 recommendations: (1) strengthen office support, (2) seek two faculty lines with an emphasis on ethnic diversity, (3) increase storage space, (4) evaluate the rigor of the three senior assignment options (two requirement a two-semester commitment and one requires only a one-semester commitment), and (5) enhance support for faculty conference travel.
   b. Department Chair and CAS Dean responses to the Review Team Report
      i. Council was referred to written report provided prior to the meeting.
      c. Council questions and summary of representatives’ responses: (JZ=Julie Zimmerman; JR=Jenn Rehg)
         i. What will happen if you don’t get the recommended faculty lines? JZ: It would be devastating because the faculty member the department has recently lost represents 1/6 of the total faculty.
         ii. What is the likelihood that a faculty line will be approved? JR: All department requests in CAS are collected in spring and needs are prioritized. Historically, replacement positions have been very valued.
         iii. What is the specific situation with the office support? JZ: The dept. could probably get by with the 15 hours per week we have, given the efficiency of the current office support specialist, but the issue is that the office is not “manned” for most of the week and gives the impression that the department is closed. The lack of office support also creates additional work and distraction for the chair as she has to act as receptionist, etc. JR: The dean’s office is currently looking at how to address these issues. Most/many departments are understaffed but all in different ways. It is a concern and is taken seriously, and it would be good to consider the issue of where support staff physically do their work (e.g., the option suggested by JZ to have support staff be physically present for a greater number
of hours in the Anthropology Department office while working on tasks for other departments) but there has been pushback on this. Departments typically want office support staff to be accessible.

iv. **How about supplementing with student workers?** JZ: This requires additional funds which the department doesn’t currently have. JR: It’s a good option. The dean’s office even has student workers.

v. **What do you think of the dean’s suggestion of a strategic hire in response to the need for more faculty?** JZ: The anthropology department would love to work with the dean on this. JR: The provost set aside a limited amount of money for the strategic hiring initiative, but there is always a possibility of pursuing this in some form.

vi. **Where do you view a comfortable student census given your faculty size?** JZ: There are 10 new majors this semester, so the number is up to ~62 currently. The difficulty is mentoring high-quality senior projects, so the dept. needs a higher faculty-student ratio than many programs. We don’t have specific numbers in answer to this question, but if we are going to continue to be a high-quality program and continue to win awards, we need more faculty.

vii. **What are the percentages of people in each of the types of senior assignment?** JZ: I don’t have specific numbers on this. In the future the department will have more specific tracking.

viii. **Timeline question: Did the Dean see the chair’s response to the review before writing his own response?** JR: YES. It doesn’t seem like the dean’s office really responded to the need for more storage space, specifically in terms of the Nature Preserve building. Can you address that? JR: There is a shortage of space on campus; probably every department feels the need for improved facilities and space. We don’t have a current option in mind but will look for space in other places; Nature Preserve building referred to by JZ is used for a variety of purposes. JZ: We are only talking about equipment, not artifacts; artifacts are stored temporarily until they go to the museum at Illinois State. More storage is needed particularly for bulky field equipment.

ix. **Anthro 300 integrates old 300 and 301. Can you clarify?** JZ: The initial goal was to have 4 classes, one for each area of anthropology (cultural, linguistic, etc.), as part of intro courses. 300 and 301 were designed to introduce fieldwork and follow-up analysis, with both cultural and linguistic anthropology addressed in each class. It didn’t work as intended for a variety of reasons, so the program switched back to the earlier version. 300 is ethnographic theory and history (largely cultural but also linguistic) and 301 is anthropology in practice, how to apply this to careers, etc.

x. **Have you discussed the perceived difference in rigor among the three senior assignment varieties as a department?** JZ: Yes. Because of teaching changes, current faculty hadn’t mentored students who had done the volunteer option until now. JZ indicated that as she was teaching it, she had the same concerns about rigor as those expressed by the review team, and she has been attempting to address it. The volunteer option hasn’t had the same supervisor feedback requirements and formal contracts as the other options. The program will begin to implement those requirements in Fall 2020.

xi. **Are you all on the same page in the department concerning adjustments to senior assignment?** JZ: Yes, we are all on the same page. Students all understand it’s 45 hours for one credit hour, 90 for two, etc. We’re working to ensure that it’s standardized and well understood by all students. When all students were doing an all-year research project, it took many students too long...
to get through. They were like mini-Master’s projects, and not all students were capable of doing that in a reasonable time. Also, with increase in student numbers (and small faculty) we could not continue with the research projects.

d. Council actions on Anthropology Program Review:

i. Program was rated by the CC as Sustainable at Present Levels

1. Process and Discussion:

a. Jane Barrow (JB) moved to rate the program Needs Intervention, Exceeds Capacity; Chaya Gopalan (CG) seconded.

b. Discussion: The current enrollment of the program is relatively consistent with historic numbers. The present concern is the loss of a faculty member who needs to be replaced. This is an issue that has recently arisen, and council members determined that there was no evidence that the program was not functioning adequately due to over-enrollment. That might be the case if this faculty member is not replaced, but isn’t a current concern. JB and CG rescinded their motion following discussion.

c. JB moved to rate the program Sustainable at Present Levels. Keith Hecht seconded. All members assented.

ii. Program was rated by the CC In Good Standing

1. Discussion: Some members expressed concern about whether the program should be flagged in order to push administration to make some changes. Specifically, four of the five review team recommendations require action on the part of CAS administration rather than program faculty. Council members expressed the idea that the program itself should be rated on its performance.

2. Keith Hecht moved to rate the program In Good Standing; Michelle Cathorall seconded; all members assented.

iii. Comments for the letter: Need for additional faculty and increased diversity; importance of moving forward with strategic hire; dean’s office taking initiative in solving the problems raised (4 out of 5 were out of the program’s control). Commendation to the department on doing lots with few resources.

3. Minutes of the November meeting stand as submitted.

4. Announcements:

a. Next meetings January 30 in the Magnolia Room for 3 program reviews. (This is an extra meeting due to the large number of Program Reviews pending.) Documents will be on SharePoint at least a week before the meeting. Format will be ½ hour for each presentation with follow-up discussion after the program/school representatives leave.

5. Unfinished Business:

a. Proposed revisions to Curriculum Council operating papers regarding Director of Assessment Duties were approved. (John Foster moved to accept, Jane Barrow seconded, all members assented)

6. Committee Reports

a. Standing Committees and Operations

i. Undergraduate Programs Committee: John Foster, Chair
   5-6 new documents to review. Will be starting those soon.

ii. Undergraduate Courses Committee: Erik Krag, Chair
   No report; just gearing up

iii. Academic Standards and Policies Committee: Faith Liebl, Chair
   Declaration of major policy needs to be revisited. It should include language to specify which body can declare the major. For example, general advising might not be the place to declare the major; CAS advising might be better.
iv. General Education Committee: no report, Eric Voss not present
v. Committee on Assessment: Michelle Cathorall
vi. Graduation Appeals Committee: Maureen Bell-Werner
   No report

b. Additional Reports
i. Enrollment Management – Chris Leopold
   a. Spring 2020 enrollment as of this morning is down 2.9% or 358 students compared to this date last year.
   b. UG is down 5.3%; Grad is up by 9.6%
   c. Fall to spring freshmen persistence is down 2.6%, a difference of 40 students compared to last year.
   d. Official spring census will occur over the weekend of January 24.
   e. Looking ahead to Fall 2020
      i. Freshman apps and admits are both up by 26%, and Springboard deposits (used as an indicator for planning to enroll) are up by 54 students compared to this week last year.
      ii. Transfer apps are down by 3.9%; transfer admits are still running even with last year.

ii. Registrar – Maureen Bell-Werner
   b. Summer and fall schedules available on Courgarnet now.
   c. Catalog entries sent out to departments for revisions.

iii. Educational Outreach - Mary Ettling
   No report

iv. Academic Advising – Effie Hortis
   No report

v. Learning Support Services and Supplemental Education – Chad Verbais
   Not present

vi. Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Planning – Elza Ibroscheva
   Met with Susan Morgan, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, to discuss areas of improvement from midpoint Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Report. Noted that frequently UG and G programs in the same dept/prog have the same learning outcomes, which is a problem. Will look at ways to have oversight and to encourage depts to have different outcomes and ensure that grad program objectives reflect advanced level; will collaborate on a process of dealing with this institutionally.

7. Public Comments: No members of the public present.
8. Meeting was adjourned at 3:38 PM.