SIUE Faculty Senate Curriculum Council
Magnolia Room, Morris University Center
February 20, 2020 – 2:30 p.m.
Approved Minutes

Members Present: Faith Liebl (Chair), Maureen Bell-Werner, Kathryn Brady, Heidy Carruthers, John Foster, Keith Hecht, Elza Ibroscheva, Erik Krag, Chris Leopold, Nima Lotfi Yagin, Ken Moffett, Geoff Schmidt, Chad Verbais, Eric Voss

Student Senate Members Present: Sabrina Chau

Guests: Tom Jordan, James Monahan

Absent: Ronald Akpan, Jane Barrow, Michelle Cathorall, Robert Bitter, Mary Ettling, Chaya Gopalan, Effie Hortis, Brad Reed, Eric Ruckh,

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the committee, Faith Liebl, at 2:30 PM.

2. Minutes of the January 30, 2020 minutes were approved as written.

3. Announcements: Next meeting March 19 in the Magnolia Room

4. Unfinished Business
   a. Discussion of Undergraduate Program Review: Speech Language Pathology and Audiology
      i. The review was presented at the CC meeting on 1/30. A quorum was not present for voting, but details of discussion were made available to CC members.
      ii. Keith Hecht moved to consider the program Sustainable at Present Levels; Ken Moffatt seconded. All assented.
      iii. Eric Voss moved to rate the program In Good Standing. Keith Hecht seconded. All assented.

   b. Discussion of Undergraduate Program Review: Public Health
      i. The review was presented at the CC meeting on 1/30. A quorum was not present for voting, but details of discussion were made available to CC members.
      ii. Eric Voss moved to rate the program In Good Standing. Keith Hecht seconded. All assented.
      iii. Eric Voss moved to rate the program In Good Standing. Keith Hecht seconded. All assented.

5. New Business
   a. Proposed Modification to 1E1 University Admission Policy; Guests: Tom Jordan (TJ), Coordinator for Policy, Communication & Issues of Concern; and James Monahan (JM), Director of Graduate and International Admissions
i. JM: In the past, ESLi, a private company, ran a program at SIUE for international students to meet English language requirements (i.e., an iBT TOEFL score of 79 or IELTS score of 6.5). The program closed suddenly (all branches in US) and an in-house version was opened (IEP). The program had to be started quickly because of a contract with a university in China which was sending students to SIUE. The students needed English language instruction before going on to study for a robotics degree. SIUE created a program, hired a director/instructor and the program is up and running through continuing education. Operating the program through continuing education has come with difficulties: students need access to facilities on campus, blackboard, etc., which they do not have through continuing education. Ideally, they would be admitted to the university since the program is in house. In order to do that, an admissions requirement change is necessary that would allow students to be admitted into the IEP and then seamlessly move to a degree program. In another change, the TOEFL/IELTS requirement would be lowered. It is currently the same for grads and undergrads and that’s not the case in most institutions. If SIUE brings down the English language requirement slightly, that will allow for greater recruiting. Some courses are already in place to provide basic skills for these students (e.g., an international student version of English composition).

ii. Council questions and responses: Are you worried that by setting standards lower you’re setting students up to fail? JM: We have considered that; our scores are just moving slightly lower. In general, these scores are consistent with what other schools do, and since we have support services already in place, we don’t feel the change is significant enough that you’re going to bring in students who are going to fail. This change also allows for students to be admitted who had their entire high school education in English (e.g., India, Nigeria) but aren’t making the required TOEFL/IELTS score, and we’re losing them to other institutions. Are other institutions’ support programs consistent with what we do or more? JM: All are going to be different. U of I has thousands of students and they probably have more support than we do. UMSL, not necessarily. What were you talking about lowering the TOEFL to? JM: 72. There’s a common European framework that puts students in large bands (A, B, C). We’re aiming for B2, which is 72 or above. The B2 band includes the 6.0 IELTS. I think this is a fair judgement. #7 seems to state that if they don’t meet the TOEFL requirements you can still admit them. So then those scores mean nothing? TJ: No, those students will be admitted only to the IEP program. Successful completion of the IEP program would take care of the English language requirement, so they have all the attributes to go into a degree program. The proposal is to conditionally admit students to an academic program but fully admit them into IEP. They’ll have access to all student services. Will they have enough classes to be full time students? TJ: Yes, they have about 20 hours per week – more class time than a typical 12-hour load would require. All classes are below 100 level –
academic development: reading, writing, oral and speaking communication, university orientation. Who’s running it? Who’s teaching in it? TJ: International Admissions/Affairs & Provost Office agreed to hire a director of IEP through enrollment management. A council member expressed concern about why the foreign language department wasn’t involved. JM: The TESOL program was involved (Joel Harding), but they would welcome additional input. TJ: It’s very new and evolving. When the other program closed, it was a scramble and foundational pieces were put in place but ongoing discussion about what partners should be involved might be possible. JM: A graduate of the SIUE TESOL program here was hired as director. 20 Chinese students started in January.

iii. Next meeting will be the second read on the proposal, so it can potentially move forward to Faculty Senate.

b. **Curriculum Council Leadership** is needed for 2020-2021, including Council Chair, Undergraduate Courses Chair, Undergraduate Programs Chair, Academic Standards and Policies Chair, and Secretary—will need to fill and approve Council Chair during March meeting
   i. Council chair must go forward for the April meeting; tabled for now; members should contact Faith with questions

c. **Computer Science Undergraduate Program Review.** Guests: Program Review Member, Shelly McDavid (SM); Computer Science Chair, Igor Crk (IC); School of Engineering Dean, Cem Karacal (CK)
   i. Program Review Team report summary
      a) Overall strengths of the program include collegiality and unity of faculty, commitment and dedication to students, emphasis on fundamental aspects of computer science, strong capstone project, good morale despite difficulties faced, and high graduation and employment rates. SM commented that the program has grown considerably over the last 8 years, but now decisions have to be made about tracks, etc. and how to handle the increased enrollment. Have low tuition compared to other programs in the region and have the opportunity to grow the program if we find resources to get faculty lines. The program was rated **Satisfactory**: Functional with potential for developing greater strengths, but with some areas needing greater attention, time, resources, etc.
      b) 5 recommendations were made for improvement: (1) request additional faculty, (2) consider creating tracks, specializations, or certifications within the undergraduate computer science program in order to evolve and grow with the field, (3) consider developing a cohesive strategy for leveraging internships for course credit, (4) develop a transparent and equitable system for determining teaching assignments, and (5) Develop a set of guidelines for the school of engineering undergraduate advising team, which is reviewed carefully
and on an ongoing basis by the department to better equip advisors to give meaningful advice.

ii. Engineering Dean and Department Chair responses: Council was referred to written reports provided prior to the meeting.

iii. Council Questions and Summary of Representatives’ Responses: Advising seems to be a recurring theme for lots of programs, not just CS. Do you want to talk about future plans? CK: We definitely plan to call for a meeting with engineering service and advisors. Have dedicated advisors for the program, but given disparities in numbers between departments, some advisors have unequal loads. We’re talking about training advisors in multiple areas so there are backups to reduce burden on advisors. Overall they do a good job – if they don’t have an answer, they reach out to the chair and faculty members. IC: All advising stuff flows through the chair eventually. I’ve been reviewing it for years and have only found a couple of cases where there are questions. I don’t understand where the concerns are coming from. It seems advisors are doing a good job. There are several layers of review before things are signed off on. Have been trying to include advisors more closely in curricular discussions etc. so it informs their advising. The CS department needs more faculty. What are the prospects of getting them? Dean: We have little control over hiring lines. That comes from academic affairs. There’s a definite need for a faculty line; have tried to patch it with instructors but especially for graduate program, we need TT faculty. Provost is well aware and is trying to make a case with the chancellor’s office to get funding for a new position. Prospects, given the budget situation, is hard to predict. The numbers in the report – are those majors or all students? IC: Enrolled students. CK: It’s one of the largest departments but at its limit in terms of class size and quality of instruction. CS graduates compete well for regional jobs but not so much for national/international jobs. Also faculty morale is good but workload is excessive. Is that fair? IC: Yes. How much thought has been given to restructuring the program? IC: We’re working on it. There will be a package coming out soon. We’re eliminating a couple of courses. Not sure what it will do with enrollment. We’re currently overburdened significantly. There’s a choice: if we want to offer more sections of a reasonable size, we need more faculty; recruiting call staff is not an option; people make more money in industry. We don’t use call staff; we have instructors. More instructors would ease the burden. Addition of any number of faculty would ease the burden but will have to ease up on enrollment to meet requirements of the bargaining agreement. Admin has agreed we need more people, but nothing seems to be forthcoming. Can only work overloads for a certain amount of time. The only option available is to cap courses. We have provided huge return on investment with increased numbers of students. Faculty are slowly getting tired and leaving. That makes the workload problem greater. Departments that have seen growth have gone online. Enrollments will surge if that happens but we can’t do that with current staffing levels. We still need additional help.
It’s unsustainable in any form. It’s also unsustainable in present form. Are you worried you have too much enrollment given current resource? IC: We have tried to meet demand by not limiting enrollment in the program. Intro class averages 150-180. End up graduating 40 students a semester or more. What if you instituted an admissions process with a high bar and appeal to a broader region (for employment, etc)? IC: Most students are from the region and stay in the region. Is this dramatically different from other programs? Most have jobs waiting at graduation. High profile organizations on coasts recruit from schools they know. CK: Moving up the requirement is a feasible strategy but when we do that we lose the narrative that we are growing and that limits the reputation/marketing. We recently received a large donation from a company that was impressed with CS graduates. Given an overtaxed program, what are we delivering? IC: We have a small army of GA’s and student workers. If we need help we get it. Don’t have a shortage of GAs because of our healthy grad program. But additional growth has to be supported somewhere along the line. The department’s tried and the dean’s office has tried and you’ve both gotten the same answer – no. Where is this situation ideal for faculty and students in the program? IC: I don’t have concern about quality; we’re not seeing a drop in placements & how well students are performing; outcomes are steady. The real concern is faculty. It’s simply a lot of time that needs to be dedicated to teaching with classes that are double the size they should be. Our quality is pretty good. If assessments are true, quality is staying high, but there will come a breaking point. We need more faculty. We have 12 (3 instructors, 8 active TTs). CK: Compare student faculty ratio to other CS programs, and they are significantly above average. Those with similar ratios are 100% teaching faculty. The research component is what sets university apart from community colleges. Computing is becoming more prominent, so there are opportunities. If we’re not going to invest, just keep what we have, we will be left behind.

iv. Council Discussion and rating
a) Keith Hecht moved to rate the program Needs Intervention, Exceeds Capacity. Ken Moffatt seconded. Discussion: The numbers in the fact book don’t seem to reflect the numbers reported. It looks more like 200. Chris Leopold indicated that the numbers include pre-engineering students with computer science interest. The students are coming into those classes but aren’t included as majors yet. This makes up the 400 mentioned in the report. This also speaks to the advising comments. Vote: All assented.
b) Discussion point: Should the program be flagged for review in two years? Nothing seems to be within the department control, so does it make sense to review it again in two years? Partial restructuring of the program might take care of enrollment concerns if new faculty aren’t hired. Can we emphasize in the report that while the program is in good standing now, it is in danger of declining if resources aren’t provided? The weakness in our process is seen in a case like this. If it
is rated “in good standing”, we won’t see it again for 8 years. We might need to rewrite our rubric to reflect situations where something needs to be done quickly. The review team gave the program a satisfactory rating, not notable merit. Was it based on lack of resources or something else? What does it mean in the context of this review process? Because of lack of faculty? Perhaps it sends a message to administration if the vote is split on good standing.

c) Geoff Schmidt moved to rate program In Good Standing. Nima Yagin seconded. The motion passed with 10 in favor and 5 opposed.

d. **Undergraduate Program Review: Mechanical Engineering.** Guests: School of Engineering Dean, Cem Karacal (CK); Mechanical Engineering Chair, Keqin Gu (KG); Review Team Members: None could attend

   i. Program Review Team report summary

a) The strong faculty is the number one strength of the program. Three professors are distinguished research award winners for their outstanding scholarly activities and reputation in their research work. Three other faculty members received the Paul Simon Outstanding Teacher-Scholar award. During the course of the interview, some students mentioned that the great reputation of the faculty is one of the reasons they ended up in SIUE Engineering. Other areas of strength identified by the undergraduates and faculty interviewed, in order of importance include: strong and effective IPAC, practical learning opportunities provided by student organization and great job opportunities at graduation. The Notable Merit rating suggested by the review team results from 3 areas in which recommendations for improvement were noted.

b) 3 Recommendations: (1) SIUE mechanical engineering program for measuring student performance in meeting student learning benchmarks or outcomes be standardized and customized by SIUE for its baccalaureate degrees in all professional courses like nursing, pharmacy, engineering and so on. SIUE should fund a major revision and upgrade it to professional version that can be patented and controlled by it. (2) When it comes to student advertising, three groups were involved in playing the role of advisors in mechanical engineering. They are (a) Engineering Student Services handled by professional advisors hired by the university, (b) Academic Advisors and Mentors by faculty members (mandatory) and (c) Technical Advising monitored by volunteer engineers of the Industry and Professional Advisory Council (IPAC) (optional). When we asked undergraduate students to compare IPAC and faculty members in terms of their role and availability as their undergraduate advisor, many of the students claimed not to know them as their advisors. Their answer sounded strange to the review team because IPAC members serve as teachers and judges in the senior engineering design course taken by all engineer students. We reviewed their roles at SIUE.
mechanical engineering and we found they are already overloaded. Hence we recommend that IPAC should be replaced as student advisors. (3) As suggested by previous review recommendation 3, annual surveys of students’ advising needs were supposed to be conducted in order to identify the right advisers/mentors to assign to them. But the report did not state if the student survey was done or substituted for. If the annual survey was done, the department should clearly state how the survey was done and identify the correct set of advisers/mentors to assign to each student.

ii. Engineering Dean and Department Chair responses: Council was referred to written reports provided prior to the meeting. CK: The advising system seems to be an effective way to handle advising. One of the things the advisory committee brought up was that having alums participate in advising is helpful in making connections. The terms advising and mentoring are sometimes used in different ways. It’s good to have those ties to industry.

iii. Council questions and summary of representatives’ responses: Council members posed no questions of the representatives.

iv. Council Discussion: One member expressed concerns about why increase in faculty was not discussed. Others indicated that it was not mentioned as a problem in the report.

v. Rating
   a) Keith Hecht moved to rate the program Sustainable at Present Levels. Geoff Schmidt seconded. All assented.
   b) Keith Hecht moved to rate the program In Good Standing. Geoff Schmidt seconded. All assented.

6. Committee Reports
   a. Standing Committees and Operations
      i. Undergraduate Programs Committee: John Foster, Chair
         Wrapping up program reviews
      ii. Undergraduate Courses Committee: Erik Krag, Chair
          Approved a total of 11(?) requests
      iii. Academic Standards and Policies Committee: Faith Liebl, Chair
           No update
      iv. General Education Committee: Eric Voss or Matthew Schunke
          Met last Thursday and today; will compile all the numbers but passed a lot of changes; will submit official record to chair
      v. Committee on Assessment: Michelle Cathorall
         Not present
      vi. Graduation Appeals Committee: Maureen Bell-Werner
          3 appeals received; all approved
   
   b. Additional Reports
      i. Enrollment Management – Chris Leopold
         Spring 2020 Census took place over the weekend of January 24, 2020.
Total enrollment for the University was 12,264, which is 2.8% down compared to Spring 2019. Graduate enrollment was up by 9.3%, while Undergraduate enrollment was down by 5.1%. We saw slight increases in international student enrollment across all levels. For anyone who would like additional information, a detailed census report has been submitted for upload to the Council’s sharepoint site.

ii. Registrar – Maureen Bell-Werner
   Announced dates for catalog changes, grades.

iii. Educational Outreach - Mary Ettling
    Not present

iv. Academic Advising – Effie Hortis
    Not present

v. Learning Support Services and Supplemental Education – Chad Verbais
   In Fall 18 changes were made in the policy for academic warning/probation. The policy says students on probation have to take a class through Learning Support Services. This was rolled out in Spring 19. Since then, 246 students have taken the class. 67% are no longer on probation. When the program was developed, the highest rate found was 30%, so this is considerably better. The average GPA of students was 1.3 and has come up to 2.25. Over 4600 credit hours have been paid for by these students that would otherwise have been lost. There is an 86.66% retention rate. This study skills course is running on a trial basis, but paperwork will be submitted to make it its own class.

vi. Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Planning—Elza Ibroscheva
   A combined UG and G meeting on assessment was held in an effort to adhere to operating papers. (They should be meeting but been). The goal is to align processes. It was discovered that a number of programs are using graduate learning outcomes to report on UG progress and are trying to correct that. Another outcome is the realization that there’s a different priority for each committee: UG is involved in annual performance reports; G tends to focus more on assessment plans. (Are they capturing student learning, etc.?). Both committees are trying to learn from each other to take a balanced approach to handle both assessment reports and assessment plans. The UG committee met to review at least 4 annual performance reports. Have started to send letters back to programs with comments and recommendations. An inventory of IBHE or development classes revealed a number of classes we no longer offer, so that needs to be cleaned up. The office is working very hard to reduce the number of developmental classes that are non-credit bearing; doing well in allowing students to progress with remedial work but without falling behind (particularly in English and Math).

7. Public Comments: No public present
8. The meeting was adjourned at 4:36