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

Student Senate Members Present: Sabrina Chau

Guests: Rakesh Bharati, Hiroshi Fujinoki, Musonda Kapatamoyo, Alicia Plemmons, Jen Rehg, Marta Simiditcheva

Absent: Ronald Akpan, Robert Bitter, Mary Ettling, Effie Hortis

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the committee, Faith Liebl, at 2:30 PM.
2. Minutes of the February 20, 2020 meeting were approved as written.
3. Announcements: Next meeting April 16. Place will be determined based on situation with Covid-19.
4. Unfinished Business
   a. Proposed Modification to 1E1 University Admission Policy
      • Keith Hecht moved to accept changes as written. Eric Voss seconded. All assented. This will move on to full senate for a first read at the April meeting.
   b. Curriculum Council Leadership 2020-2021. Full senate will have to approve Council Chair. FL recommends that Assistant Professors and department chairs not take on the council chair position. Positions were filled or deferred as follows:
      i. Council Chair -- Keith Hecht
      ii. Undergraduate Courses Chair -- deferred
      iii. Undergraduate Programs Chair – John Foster
      iv. Academic Standards and Policies Chair -- deferred
      v. Secretary — Kathryn Brady
5. New Business
   a. Undergraduate Program Review: Economics (CAS)
      Program Review Member: Hiroshi Fujinoki (HF)
      Economics Chair: Rakesh Bharati (RB)
      Economics Faculty: Alicia Plemmons (AP)
      College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean: Jen Rehg (JR)
      i. Review Team Report Summary: The UG-ECON program received one Notable Merit and one Satisfactory rating by the review team (one review team member was unable to vote because of the person’s health condition). The review team observed that the UG-ECON program is well-developed with positive outcomes and traits in many areas but with some opportunities for improvements without any serious issues.
         • Self-study report, interviews, and surveys show the effectiveness and excellence of the program. Responses from the interviewees also demonstrated positive learning by its students. The interviews with faculty members by the review team also indicate that they value quality in their teaching, as well as in their contribution to students’ career development after their graduation from the program.
         • The following recommendations were made:
            o Possible outreach to improve the presence of the program (UG ECON) to regional educational institutes
            o Having an external advisory board
            o Systematic mentoring of its students by Economics faculty members
o Seminars and workshops (by inviting local industry’s representatives) for helping its students to have such knowledge.

ii. CAS Dean and Department Chair responses: Council was referred to written reports provided prior to the meeting. RB: The Econ Program is in the School of Business but being offered in CAS. This presents unique challenges. It’s a hybrid. A typical problem is confusion between the CAS Econ program and Business School Econ program. There is a problem of identity and market. It was decided that the same program couldn’t be offered in two places. Solution was to have the Business School program serve the CAS constituency and disciplines in CAS (psych, sociology, etc.) Have been broadening electives, etc.

iii. Council questions and summary of representatives’ responses: The review team talked about need for support for teaching. Is that just because there are some courses that you don’t offer because of recent retirements? RB: Yes. Those are courses we need to cover that we are not able to. We need a course in public health, global issues and the economy. We’d love to offer that on the CAS side, but we don’t have the faculty. There are many courses we could offer that would serve public administration, etc., but they can’t be offered because of faculty shortages. AP: New faculty have brought two new courses in dealing with policy. Does your department have health economists? AP: Yes, two. RB: We have a health economics program, but not enough faculty to teach courses. Have to work with accreditation which requires a certain number of courses to be taught by TT faculty. We have a range of courses, but we could offer more if not short-handed all the time. Econ 111 and 112. Do you want to elaborate about plans for those courses and how they affect program size and retention? RB: These are gen ed requirement and required courses for Econ and Business. 112 is Micro, 111 is Macro. Used to be very large format courses until last year. There were 96 students per class up to that point. We managed to negotiate class size down to 70. AP: Because of this can have more teamwork, work with writing, group work, etc. We can work on mathematical skills, etc. This lets students get a more rounded look at what the field is. Do you have any statistics that measure impact of class size? RB: The change just went into effect last fall so we are waiting to report. The DFW rate can be as high as 30%. The large class size is counterproductive because we can’t pay enough attention to students and they’re not being retained. Collected data on students over the last 20 years. Ran a regression on success and class size. Don’t have current data, but that will be included in annual report. Some mention that final project for senior assignment is changing. How and why is it changing? RB: We used to do projects in two quantitative courses and students would present a poster on a project done in one of the classes. It was a good experience but there was not much discrimination in student performance. A second problem is that we have the most diverse program in terms of faculty, but students are mostly white males. Perhaps to reach out to other groups, we should move from a narrow quantitative focus. We introduced a new course that lets students do basic economic analysis. Also, a poster session is not enough to evaluate a course that is now more diverse. We want to be able to test students in different areas of the discipline, not just quantitative but health economics, etc. We also did not get a sense of integration of information from the previous assignment. Now it includes reflection. Student should argue what they have learned over time and how it meets liberal educational objectives. We also get a writeup from student about what they think about the career and how their courses have led them to a certain career. AP: We have started econ club and officers are from CAS, so it has broken into a CAS-centered focus, so students have a clearer idea of what that looks like. What about the mentoring suggestions made by students? AP: On average, there are 17 students attending CAS student meetings and a lot of people from nursing, sociology, political science, etc. The wide variety is mostly from CAS side. Instead of finance-based activities, we have field trips, outreach activities, etc. to get a better sense of the
CAS side. We also have more internship opportunities (e.g., with city of Edwardsville), economics-related health policies, etc. They seem to enjoy the club. Can you briefly talk about your graduation/retention rates and enrollment? RB: This is awkward to answer. We have decent enrollment (~36), and it’s rapidly going up, but we don’t graduate enough people. Where do they go? (1) Students enroll in CAS econ in order to get their GPA up to a level required by the Business School and then go into the Business School; (2) Some have dual degrees/dual majors. The econ degree can be obtained with few courses (initially 7 to 9), so many take a second degree and they count as enrolled but don’t count as having a degree because the first degree is noted. Might be good to double major in econ and math? Yes, there’s a whole range of students who are essentially doing a double major and that does not show up. If we can increase the number of students, that will help. Today we have a much broader range of electives but need more faculty to offer more.

b. CC discussion and decisions: Elsa brought up a good point about number of students vs number of faculty. I was surprised there were so many faculty for so few students. They serve a lot of students in the business school. EI: I’m looking at the table in the self-study showing that in the past 10 years, they’re graduating between 5 to 8 people. Seems like a long time to be stuck at that level. I see what he’s saying about students migrating into business as soon as they can and also the number of students with double majors and econ is the second major, but I still wonder if this is a good explanation for this trend to be the normal status quo for 10 years or so. EV: That double major thing is an issue across campus. It’s hard to track attendance when there’s a double major. It’s a flip of the coin which major counts. JF: It’s typically the first major they pick (the first declared) that shows up. The way to think about it is, is this mismatch between enrollment and degrees conferred greater for them than for other quantitative disciplines like math and stats? Is it unusual? ER: How many people are graduating in econ? Fact book shows numbers are growing, almost doubled, but degrees conferred is 5, 7, 8. Technically there isn’t an enrollment problem, there is a graduation problem. But they could be graduating under the other major. Recommendation could be “sustainable” but require accurate capture of the numbers graduating and being retained. CL: looks like only 1 double major currently. EI: doesn’t seem like the explanation is adequate. Is econ tracking how many students are not graduating from their program because they’re going into business? Jane Barrow moved that Enrollment is Sustainable at Present Levels. John Foster seconded. All assented

c. Chaya Gopalan moved to rate the program In Good Standing. Jane Barrow seconded. All assented

d. Undergraduate Program Review: Mass Communications
Program Review Members: Marta Simidchieva (MS)
Mass Communications Chair: Musonda Kapatamoyo (MK)
College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean: Jen Rehg (JR)

i. Review Team Report Summary: The program was rated Notable Merit. Well developed with positive outcomes or traits in many areas, but with some opportunities for improvement.

• The program is particularly proud of its diverse faculty, accreditation, and students. The program has taken steps to address the recommendations since the last review and has a number of overall strengths. In particular, the program works to continuously improve and stay current with industry trends; uses assessment data to make decisions; offers opportunities for advising, mentoring, and collaboration. There are no concerns regarding retention. Facilities are considered “top of the range”. For the most part, students are satisfied, and they appreciate opportunities to apply their knowledge in upper-level coursework. There appears to be collegiality and good communication among faculty.

• The following recommendations were made:
  o Recommendation #1: The program has a need for additional personnel.
o Recommendation #2: The program should consider assigning tenure track faculty to teach MC 201 and MC 202 and/or increase coordination efforts.

o Recommendation #3: The program should consider implementing a process for monitoring students’ development of writing skills across the program.

o Recommendation #4: The program should continue to secure up-to-date technology needed for instruction and student learning.

o Recommendation #5: The program should increase student awareness of mentoring opportunities and consider collecting data on students’ utilization of the mentoring program to continuously improve mentoring efforts.

o Recommendation #6: The program should consider a more systematic approach to evaluation of student learning in the senior assignment.

o Recommendation #7: A more accurate count of student enrollment in the Mass Communications program is needed. In particular, providing students the opportunity for direct admission would more accurately reflect student enrollment in 200-level coursework.

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

iii. Council questions and summary of Representatives’ responses: There were some comments about senior assignment and making evaluation more systematic. Can you discuss? MK: We have an assessment plan that we developed and adopted in 2017, so we use that to evaluate student learning and they are also assessed from the internship. MS: The review team’s concern was more the cohesion of the evaluation of the senior assignment. Didn’t seem consistent across graduating students. MK: This could be a result of our three tracks. Students in different tracks (journalism, advertising, etc.) are evaluated differently based on their track. But as far as an overall assessment plan, we have one that is meant to fairly evaluate student learning. Who is evaluating? MK: We have different kinds of measurements, direct and indirect. Direct = senior portfolio and internship evaluations which includes 5 hours of internship and the report of their manager. There are also entry and exit surveys. The last direct measure is a survey of experience. We also have indirect measures such as student awards, etc. MS and CG: Some of the evaluations were done by alumni, though, so the range was huge. This was new, right? MK: We send portfolio out to alumni that are in the track that students have taken. Did this clarify the issue raised by the review team? EI: The issue is how the people involved in evaluating the work understand the scope, the process and have consistent instructions so that everyone’s work is evaluated consistently. Track shouldn’t matter. The point is to make sure everyone reads the same manual and that scoring is consistent. MK highlighted the need for an additional faculty member. JR clarified the nature of direct admit and the different options available to departments. She noted that the 200-level courses served as a bottle-neck in this case and this would have to be changed in order to have more students in the program.

iv. Council Discussion and Decision: John Foster moved to rate the program Sustainable At Current Levels. Jane Barrow seconded. All assented.

v. Status of department: Ken Moffat moved to rate the program In Good Standing; Keith Hecht seconded. All assented.

6. Committee Reports
   a. Standing Committees and Operations
      i. Undergraduate Programs Committee: John Foster, Chair
         - Have processed a number of proposals; offered extension for some deadlines due to transitions caused by Covid-19.
      ii. Undergraduate Courses Committee: Erik Krag, Chair
         - Have processed a number of proposals.
iii. Academic Standards and Policies Committee: Faith Liebl, Chair
   • No report

iv. General Education Committee: Eric Voss or Matthew Schunke
   • See posted report

v. Committee on Assessment: Michelle Cathorall
   • Met Friday before spring break; reviewed annual performance report; letters are going out; continuing work as scheduled.

vi. Graduation Appeals Committee: Maureen Bell-Werner
   • 5 graduation appeals; all approved

b. Additional Reports
   i. Enrollment Management – Chris Leopold
      • No report
   ii. Registrar – Maureen Bell-Werner
      • Registration is scheduled to happen Monday for both summer and fall. Things have been very busy!
   iii. Educational Outreach - Mary Ettling
      • No report
   iv. Academic Advising – Effie Hortis
      • All advisors are out of the office and are advising through Zoom or email.
   v. Learning Support Services and Supplemental Education – Chad Verbais
      • No report
   vi. Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Planning– Elza Ibroscheva
      • We have redesigned the website. Please be patient if you’re looking for things using google. The redesign leads to discontinued pages having to time themselves out. Senior assignment showcase was canceled in response to covid-19 situation.

7. Public Comments
   • none

8. Meeting was adjourned at 4:05.