The meeting was called to order at 2:31 PM by Keith Hecht (KH), CC Chair. KH introduced new student member, Julia Goren, who is replacing Carson Brimm on the council.

Consideration of Minutes of 1/21/21 meeting
No modifications or corrections were recommended; the minutes stand as submitted.

Subcommittee Reports
a. Standing Committees / Operations Reports
   i. Undergraduate Courses Committee – Debbie Sellnow-Richmond
      Everything has been moved forward except 15 proposals that are awaiting originator changes.
   ii. Undergraduate Programs Committee – John Foster
      Voted on 3 proposals and sent them back to originators for revisions.
   iii. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Kevin Hockenberry
      Did not meet this week to vote on task and recommendations; will meet next week instead; KH will send a report out; there will be a lot for CC to review by the next meeting
   iv. General Education Committee – Eric Voss
      In the midst of scheduling the next meeting; nothing to report
   v. Committee on Assessment Liaison – Kelley McGuire
      No report
   vi. Graduation Appeals Committee Liaison – Maureen Bell-Werner
      1 appeal received and approved

b. University Reports
   i. Enrollment Management – Chris Leopold
      Official census headcount report was approved an uploaded for review.
   ii. Registrar – Maureen Bell-Werner
      Catalog edits for academic year 21-22 are due March 15; will move forward with that; 1st 8-week grades are due 3/15; the catalog is now available for fall 2021.
   iii. Educational Outreach - Mary Ettling
      The office has posted several student worker positions to assist faculty with Techsmith Knowmia video captioning. Hopefully this will be helpful to faculty and also to students requiring accommodations
   iv. Academic Advising – Effie Hortis
      Summer and fall advising is in progress virtually
   v. Learning Support Services and Supplemental Education – Chad Verbais
      Offering virtual and in person appointments for students who need academic assistance
   vi. Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Planning – Elza Ibrosecheva
      Are recruiting for student success coaches to create support network for students who are struggling with online education; hope to have those people on the team as soon as possible; part of student success programs; will notify faculty when they arrive.
Also working on making sure that HOC changes in reporting requirements are met; have to make sure we inform HOC of all certificates we approve and offer.

4. Unfinished Business
   None

5. New Business
   a. Revision to 1E1 regarding the establishment of an Intensive English Pathway Program -- James Monahan (JM) and Asha Cansal (AC)
      i. JM: The Intensive English Program (IEP) is proposing a modification to its current structure to create a pathway program. AC: The IEP has been running for past year. (It began Jan 20). The proposed modification would add an extra tier (pathway) to the program to allow students who are close to meeting the university’s English proficiency requirements to take a limited number of academic credits while completing English courses in the IEP. JM: Historically, programs could make this change on their own; now it has to be approved by U.S. Immigration, so we are proposing the change to them at the same time as to CC. By being able to take one academic class, students are also reminded how important it is to improve English skills. The reason for two separate tiers is that the undergrad English requirement was lowered slightly; graduates need to get to higher English level before taking academic courses. In the pathway program, academic classes that students could take concurrently with English courses (in pathways) will be preapproved by departments. (There will be 5-6 designed courses at the undergrad level). Students can’t just go into the catalog and choose any course they want. At the graduate level, it’s more individualized, but the program has to be approved through Immigration. We talked with engineering and got a positive response from program. We all want to make sure students have the skills they need to succeed. We will work individually with each student to choose the appropriate courses. If a department doesn’t agree, students will be in full-time English.
      ii. Council Members’ Questions and Summary of Representatives’ Responses: (1) Any idea how many students will be impacted? JM: no idea. The program is small right now, but we’re trying to grow it; this would help with recruitment. If students have to go to English, they’re choosing universities with a Pathway program. Numbers will almost certainly be small initially – no more than 10 probably. (2) What about the preapproval process? Will the classes be gen-ed courses? Who will sign off on this? JM: We welcome input about what the process should look like. The recommendation would come from AC as director of the IEP. AC: The answer is still forming. The Pathway option should aid in recruitment; it’s more of a trend across the US, so it will help us remain competitive. (3) So the class recommendations would be specific to the student? AC: Yes, we would keep students away from courses they were not likely to be successful in. JM: If we get approval for the program, we’ll go to departments and consult; academic advising has already made some recommendations. So 5-10 classes might be preapproved, but the decision will be made based on what students need. (4) Currently these students are not degree-seeking students. At what point do they become degree-seeking? JM: Their status won’t change until they have met the English-language requirement. Students ARE admitted fully to the university, and they can take a class with approval, but they’ll remain unclassified, non-degree seeking student until the language requirement is met. When that happens, they can then petition to have the credit hours from courses taken in Pathway accepted. IEP and Pathway courses all have numbers below 100. They are SIUE courses, but they don’t count toward a degree. This proposal would allow them to take one additional course in Pathway that can be used toward their degree once they are fully admitted. (5) What happens if they fail? AC: They can fail once and repeat, but if they fail again, they can’t continue. (6) What does it mean that the program can be authorized for up to 4 semesters? JM: There are potentially 3 levels in the IEP, and students can repeat one time. (6) Are maps going to be in the policy? JM: I don’t think so; it doesn’t seem appropriate as part of the policy. (7) How do students register for courses? What’s the gateway process of getting them into the appropriate courses? Effie Hortis: Courses are pre-identified and specific academic advisors will meet with international students.
      iii. Council recommended change in wording for clarity: “up to 2 terms for UG and up to 3 terms for GRAD”. Chad Verbaas: I would like to build additional support into the system, and we also need to be clear up-front about the expectations -- what students need to do. AC: We will provide support during their time in the IEP: Outside tutoring, etc. We provide as much support as we can, socially
as well as academically. KH: We’re talking about program building rather than policy. We need to focus on policy. Some of this discussion will be important in another venue.

iv. Erik Voss made a motion to accept the proposal with modified wording as indicated above; Kathryn Brady seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a bundled rollcall vote.

b. **Recommendations from ad hoc committee for review of Admissions Criteria.**
KH: The committee has not yet completed their recommendations. They are having a change in Committee chair. The committee had a general feel for what recommendations they would make but don’t have a document drafted at this time. Kevin Hockenberry and Chris Leopold are on that committee. They will try to get it together in a week or two to refocus and get on track. The only way the proposal will get through CC and FS before the end of the academic year is to have a special meeting. That will not happen until there is a final document in hand. If we don’t get it finished this academic year, it’s OK. Plans are being made to make the temporary policy (involving removing standardized test requirement) valid for next year. Thanks to Kevin and Chris for serving on the committee.

c. **Program Review – Construction Management**
Program Review Member: Alisha Plemmons (AP)
Construction Management Interim Chair: Chris Gordon (CG)
Construction Management Faculty Member: Anne Werner (AW)
School of Engineering Dean: Cem Karacal (CK)

i. Program Review Team Report Summary (An abbreviated review was conducted since the program had just undergone an extensive accreditation review.)

   a) Overall Strengths: This program has many admirable qualities. Even though there are noticeable lapses in staffing that force incumbent faculty to wear many hats and perform work above and beyond reasonable requirements, this department has managed to provide a well-rounded and enriching student learning experience. In their time within the program, students are exposed to many hands-on learning activities and projects. The department maintains three student clubs and has a developed network of construction companies of interest to the students. Some previous reports have cited that the mathematical rigor may be too advanced for the program. However, we believe it is reasonable for a degree within the engineering school and that the department has been responsive to working with students for alternative pathways to obtaining math skills.

   b) 3 recommendations were made for improvement: (1) Two New Faculty Lines. The addition of new faculty lines will enable the division of the immense work over more faculty members and will allow for a better performing department. Many of the recommendations of this study and the previous studies could be resolved with additional faculty lines. We recommend either two tenure/tenure-track lines or one tenure track and one full-time instructor position. (2) Diversity and Inclusivity. Diversity within the student population in terms of attracting underrepresented minority groups or women is lacking. Efforts should be made to actively recruit and attract students from a diverse set of backgrounds. (3) Student Opportunities to Consult Alongside Faculty. In our understanding, construction management programs at various schools often have faculty consult within the community. We recommend that these opportunities include students, both as an additional source of research support for the faculty member and as a learning experience for the undergraduate student. This may allow faculty to increase research and service opportunities without greatly expanding the budgetary constraints.

c) The review team assigned the program a rating of Notable Merit.

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

iii. Council Questions for Review Team Chair (AP) and Summary of Responses: How many students are involved? 88 students now; want to be 110-120. Do only 10% of their students actually graduate? This was written confusingly; 10% of students graduate each year. What was the timeframe of the review? Looks like there are some searches underway now. We were not provided that information when we were given the packet in September. There might have been decisions in progress that the review team was not made aware of. It looks like there have been recent change of leadership. Can you speak to that? It seemed faculty were comfortable with this.

iv. Council Questions for Interim Dept Chair (CG) and Dean (CK) and summary of responses: It looks like one of recommendations from the study was faculty hires. It looks like those are underway. How far
along are they? Approved? Interviewing candidates? CG: One is related to a resignation and one to a retirement, so faculty searches were approved at the time of the review; lots of response for junior faculty position; more limited response for senior faculty (dept chair) but there’s a good pool. Have narrowed search to 2 and are finalizing recommendations. Will review 60+ applications for junior faculty position to decide who to invite. 

Does this expand faculty or just replace? CG: It puts us back at even strength. Was there an additional instructor as well? CK: We are adding two but have a full-time instructor now. Is instructor position permanent or up in the air? CK: Depends on funding. He came in to make sure all courses could be offered while faculty was low. 

How long has program been without a full-time chair? CK: Since last summer (August 2020). Have to recognize that Chris served as chair for a long time so he’s serving as interim with a lot of experience. Were you able to address the diversity goals? CG: Diversity goals were considered in terms of faculty search; in terms of students, it’s a challenge in addition to enrollment in general. We are active in any school initiative relevant to enrollment and recruitment but haven’t made any progress in terms of diversity of the student body. The biggest step so far is scholarship support. Have expressed the need to find scholarship support for incoming freshmen; revamped criteria to include preference for underrepresented students. Received $30,000 additional for our endowment with this revamped criterion. 

What steps are being done to have females and other minority background in recruiting and marketing materials? CG: The department engaged a senior design project to create a marketing campaign for enrollment (video, webpage suggestions). We showcased clubs, and a number of women and minorities are represented there. CK: At the school level, many initiatives are in place; East St Louis Upward Bound program; representation in marketing materials; recruitment events, etc. We’re working with the National Society for Black Engineers and the equivalent for Hispanic engineers. Will have recruiting events as well.

v. Council Discussion and Ratings: Chaya Gopalan made a motion to rate the program In Good Standing. Kevin Hockenberry seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a bundled rollcall vote. John Foster moved to rate the program Sustainable at Present Enrollment. Chaya Gopalan seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a bundled rollcall vote.

d. SET Continuous Review Committee

KH: Filling in on the SET Continuous Review Committee for the vacant Director of Assessment position will be Dr. Gillian Acheson from Department of Geography and Geographic Information Sciences

6. Public Comments

None present.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 PM by KH, Chair.