SIUE Faculty Senate Curriculum Council
Zoom Meeting
https://siue.zoom.us/j/95575061531
April 16, 2020 – 3:00 p.m.
Unapproved Minutes

Members Present: Faith Liebl (Chair), Robert Bitter, Kathryn Brady, Heidy Carruthers, Mary Ettling, John Foster, Keith Hecht, Effie Hortis, Elza Ibrovscheva, Erik Krag, Chris Leopold, Nima Lotfi Yagin, Ken Moffett, Geoff Schmidt, Chad Verbais, Eric Voss

Guests: Cem Karacal, Melissa Thomeczek

Absent: Ronald Akpan, Jane Barrow, Maureen Bell-Werner, Michelle Cathorall, Sabrina Chau, Chaya Gopalan, Brad Reed, Eric Ruckh

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the committee, Faith Liebl, at 3:04 PM.
2. Minutes of the March 2020 meeting were approved as written.
3. Announcements: Next meeting will be Fall Semester 2020.
4. Unfinished Business—none
5. New Business
   A. Undergraduate Program Review: Electrical Engineering
      Program Review Chair: Anni Reinking (not present)
      Electrical Engineering Chair: Andrej Lozowski (not present)
      School of Engineering Dean: Cem Karacal (CK)
      i. Program Review Team Report
         a. Rating: “The overall strength of the program is its adaptability. It has continued to meet the rising demand for this field of study and continues to graduate high-quality students. The program has a stable and rigorous curriculum that serves the needs of students who are invariably able to gain meaningful employment upon graduation. The faculty are also found to have strong working relationships amongst one another that leads to successful collaboration.” The program was rated exemplary.
         b. Recommendations: (1) An increase in faculty lines for the Department of Engineering is critical; (2) There should be a focus on recruitment and retention of a more diverse undergraduate student body; (3) sustain enrollment and recruitment.
      ii. Engineering Dean and Department Chair Responses: Reports posted on Sharepoint.
      iii. Council members had no questions for the representatives.
      iv. Council discussion and decisions: JF: There appears to be a recent decline in numbers. Also, we don’t know what year students declare the major. Both undeclared and declared numbers seem to have dropped. Not sure what data source is being used to claim that student numbers are increasing or steady. This seems to be a problem with reports in general. The number piece needs to be standardized. If it’s such an important part of the review process, it should be clearly laid out how the numbers are arrived at. FL: The program gets a series of prompts and it’s up to the program to respond how they like. JF: Yes, I think that’s a problem. If we’re going to take this seriously, it needs to be a more standardized process. CL: The program is supposed to get the information directly from institutional research, so it’s collected the same way at the self-
study stage, but it’s not necessarily presented in a consistent form. FL: The biggest issues were faculty and lab space. If they don’t need to hire two new faculty, maybe that’s not such an issue. Advising always comes up, and diversity often comes up. The only issue noted in the report seems outside the control of the department: having a place for international students to do their internships. They haven’t been able to do that.

a. Ken Moffat moved to rate the program Sustainable at Present Levels; John Foster seconded. All members assented.

b. Ken Moffat moved to rate the program In Good Standing; Keith Hecht seconded; all members assented.

B. Undergraduate Program Review: Civil Engineering

Program Review Chair: Melissa Thomeczek (MT)
Civil Engineering Chair: Ryan Fries (RF)
School of Engineering Dean: Cem Karacal (CK)

i. Program Review Team Report

a. Rating: “From a faculty perspective, the SIUE CE program is unique among peer institutions because many faculty members are licensed professional engineers. Faculty have earned many grants, resulting in additional funding for both SIUE and the CE Program. Finally, the faculty provide students with mentorship and guidance throughout the program. Nearly all students reported positive experiences with interacting with CE faculty. From a student perspective, the CE program is a quality experience as well. All students work with a corporation during their senior project to learn about practical applications of class content. Students report feeling confident about entering the field of Engineering upon graduation. Students indicate many support mechanisms, such as the ASCE student organization, to be excellent opportunities for both student professional development and Engineering content review sessions as they prepare for the CF exam.” The program was rated Notable Merit.

b. Recommendations: (1) The Civil Engineering program is encouraged to assess and track the condition of its major equipment so that priorities can be established and a long-range plan for addressing equipment needs can be made.; (2) The CE Program is encouraged to seek University support specifically targeted to minority (including female) recruitment.

ii. Engineering Dean and Department Chair Responses: Reports posted on SharePoint

iii. Council members’ questions and summary of representatives’ responses: none

iv. Council discussion and decisions:

a. Kathy Brady moved to rate the program Sustainable at Present Levels; Erik Voss seconded. All members assented.

b. Erik Voss moved to rate the program In Good Standing; John Foster seconded; all members assented.

6. Committee Reports

A. Standing Committees and Operations

i. Undergraduate Programs Committee: John Foster, Chair
   1 package approved sent two Form 91As back for revisions

ii. Undergraduate Courses Committee: Erik Krag, Chair
   Approved a total of 18; sent back 20

iii. Academic Standards and Policies Committee: Faith Liebl, Chair
   Two issues to be addressed next Fall, one of which is revisiting the student grievance policy
iv. General Education Committee: Eric Voss or Matthew Schunke
   Report posted on shared drive. Important change: e-sports no longer
   qualify as Health Experiences courses.

v. Committee on Assessment: Michelle Cathorall
   No report

vi. Graduation Appeals Committee: Maureen Bell-Werner
   No report

B. Additional Reports

i. Enrollment Management – Chris Leopold
   Report posted on sharepoint. Highlights: Undergraduate enrollment down 14%
   for summer; 8% for Fall. Springboard deposits down from last year. Student
   engagement survey closes tomorrow to flag concerns about student involvement
   during transition to online coursework; current response rate is 37%.

ii. Registrar – Maureen Bell-Werner
    No report

iii. Educational Outreach - Mary Ettling
   Working with group across disciplines and offices to look at online degree
   completion programs and make sure we meet compliance standards, have
   student services that are equitable for online services. More to come on that
   but there is intentional work to explore how best to serve our online students.
   Working to knock barriers down behind the scenes and this is helping in the
   current situation.

iv. Academic Advising – Effie Hortis
   No report

v. Learning Support Services and Supplemental Education – Chad Verbais
   Have successfully transitioned all tutoring and support services online;
   numbers are starting to pick up. Are happy how things are going so far.

vi. Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Planning – Elza Ibroscheva
   Working on getting curricunet documents moved forward; reviewing lots of
   paperwork and getting it moved through the various levels. As we’re
   reviewing documents it’s important to note that programs have to make sure
   to submit the correct paperwork, especially for termination of minors.
   Reminder to make sure to submit all the necessary paperwork so it doesn’t
   have to be bounced back for something (even if it looks like minutae).

7. Public Comments
   None

8. Meeting was adjourned at 3:49