1. The meeting was called to order at 2:32 PM by Keith Hecht (KH), CC Chair.

2. Consideration of Minutes of 2/18/21 meeting
   No modifications or corrections were recommended; the minutes stand as submitted.

3. Subcommittee Reports
   a. Standing Committees / Operations Reports
      i. Undergraduate Courses Committee – Debbie Sellnow-Richmond
         Looking good. Have three classes and one package to review; should move forward quickly.
      ii. Undergraduate Programs Committee – John Foster
         Approved one and sent three back for revisions.
      iii. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Kevin Hockenberry
         Reviewed the declaration of major policy; seems that a policy change is not necessary. There is an issue only within CAS which seems to be a need to make their process more efficient. The committee approved a statement for diversity and agreed that that should be a university-wide policy included in all syllabi. A formal recommendation will come to CC in the future.
      iv. General Education Committee – Eric Voss
         Met today and went through student appeals; will meet again next week; more to report at next CC meeting.
      v. Committee on Assessment Liaison – Kelley McGuire
         Met March 5. They completed 2 full committee reviews (Criminal Justice & Physics) and 3 expedited reviews (Music, Nutrition, Mass Communication); SETs are a continuous review item.
      vi. Graduation Appeals Committee Liaison – Maureen Bell-Werner
         Meeting cancelled because there were no appeals.

b. University Reports
   i. Enrollment Management – Chris Leopold
      Fall 2021 Statistics as of Monday, March 15, 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>International Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apps</td>
<td>10,716 (-6%)</td>
<td>1,189 (-17%)</td>
<td>1508 (+24%)</td>
<td>146 (-5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits (&amp; Approvals)</td>
<td>8,024 (+15%)</td>
<td>807 (-11%)</td>
<td>635 (+19%)</td>
<td>90 (+18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard Deposits</td>
<td>803 (+20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   - Admits are up in all categories but Transfer.
• Springboard deposits (a proxy for intent to enroll) are up by 20% compared to same date last year.
• Undergraduate Admissions hosted a virtual Parent/Guardian/Family night on Tuesday, March 16. Approximately 142 registered attendees viewed presentations on Financial Aid, University Housing, and Springboard to Success.
• Graduate Admissions will host a virtual Open House, scheduled for Thursday, March 25, 2021; to date, close to 200 people have registered to attend.
• Preliminary enrollment totals for Summer and Fall 2021 will be available at the April meeting of Curriculum Council, as registration opens Monday, March 29, 2021.

ii. Registrar – Maureen Bell-Werner
Registration for Summer Semester opens March 29. We’ve pushed back production of the class schedule for Spring until this summer, likely mid-August.

iii. Educational Outreach - Mary Ettling
Working on an online program development tool kit. Lots of resources on moving programs to online format, compliance, etc. Will do report and send link to this information soon.

iv. Academic Advising – Effie Hortis
Continues for Summer Semester. March 1, springboard is mainly face-to-face; registration will start May 3.

v. Learning Support Services and Supplemental Education – Chad Verbais
No report.

vi. Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Planning– Elza Ibroscheva
Trying to get through approvals for academic program changes and clear out the queue. These align with the catalog so trying to do as much as possible to move these forward. If there’s anything else that will be going through that’s critically needed, let me know. There’s a tendency for me to send revision requests to initiators and then nothing moves. Frequently people who initiate the change are no longer in the position they were in when the process started. Would like suggestions about how to avoid having this happen. Curricunet generates a message indicating that changes are required but it doesn’t always have an effect.
KC suggested that chairs always be included in this correspondence so that they can oversee the process since they’re not always the originator. MBW: I think that we can put multiple people on it. EI: Will consider implementing this change if possible.

4. Unfinished Business

a. Revision to 1E1 regarding the establishment of an intensive English Pathway Program.
   No questions or concerns about the policy were brought up. Kevin Cannon moved to approve the wording of the policy and move it forward to Faculty Senate. Debbie Sellnow-Richmond seconded. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously on a rollcall vote.

5. New Business

a. Program Review – Exercise Science
   Program Review Chair: Kathleen Vongsathorn (KV)
   Applied Health Chair: Huaibo Xi (HX)
   Exercise Science UG Program Director: Bryan Smith (BS)
   SEHHB Dean: Robin Hughes (RH)
   i. Program Review Team Report Summary (An abbreviated review was conducted since the program had just undergone an extensive accreditation review.)
      a) Overall Strengths: Documentation provided for this review indicates that the program has a number of strengths. The faculty and staff are clearly devoted to the current and future students, serving as tireless advocates for student learning. The program provides a number of different options and opportunities for clinical experience/internships, which students can focus towards their career interests. The process of placing students in the field for experiences is exemplary. The program has exceptional presence and connection with the community. The program is successful in keeping class sizes low and providing ample opportunities for students to enroll in required courses.
b) 4 recommendations were made for improvement: (1) The program should continue developing and expanding alumni relations. An exit survey of majors, or a survey that alumni are invited to respond to, might better assess the extent to which the program prepares students for their careers or future studies in the field. Another potential avenue for strengthening and expanding relationships with alumni may be through the inception of an annual program reception where both current and former faculty and students can get together in an informal setting, exchange information, develop contacts, etc. Finally, program newsletter containing alumni news (among other things) may be another tool to consider. (2) Insofar as it is possible, the program should address the difficulties that have arisen from eliminated faculty overloads and hiring adjunct instructors. If funds are not forthcoming for faculty overloads, the program could try modifying their recruitment strategy to find qualified adjuncts or develop some kind of contingency plan for course assignments, with increased class sizes, as a last resort measure. (3) The program should encourage and create opportunities for faculty to engage in professional development in their industry and as members of discipline of higher education. (4) The program has been doing excellent job maintaining even gender distribution within the student body. The program should continue in its effort to recruit more minority students and enhance the diversity of the student body.

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

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

iii. Council Questions for Review Team Chair (KV) and Summary of Responses: Where did the recommendation for increased faculty development come from? KV: the faculty survey; a subset of faculty didn’t feel there were adequate opportunities. What about the concern about quality of adjunct instructors? Faculty commented that they had found it difficult to find qualified instructors. The pool isn’t large enough of people who are working out well. Some have quit in the middle of the semester. Some have performed at a level that doesn’t warrant hiring them for another semester. Is it possibly a function of COVID and the online courses? Especially given the low pay and increased work? They didn’t comment on that. Just mostly there’s not a big enough pool. It does seem to be a situation that stretched back before COVID. As for salaries, that’s probably another factor, but they didn’t discuss it. This seemed different from most reviews in that most programs are asking for more faculty and this program seems to be specifically asking for overloads. Is that accurate? Yes, it is. There was a specific request for more overloads. The report seems very glowing until you get to the section about adjuncts, etc. Yes, comments from accreditation were very positive about faculty, but when faculty were reflecting on their own challenges, the issue of lack of adjuncts came up. Lab equipment and space seemed fairly positive. Is that accurate? Yes, on the whole. Since the last review, they have acquired a lot of new machines so that was mentioned as positive. If there were sentiments about wanting more, that didn’t come out. But the issue of ongoing maintenance seemed to be an issue. Maintenance funds couldn’t be applied for in advance so it’s up to the program to maintain the equipment every year. It can’t be organized in advance.

Chaya Gopalan (CC member and member of program being reviewed) indicated adjuncts leaving mid-semester isn’t ongoing. Have had some stronger adjuncts in the intervening time. The program has added more tenure-track positions to replace candidates who have left, and are recruiting a new instructor (with a strong applicant pool). The program is in a stronger position currently than the reviewers might have seen a year ago. Do you have insight into overload issue? CG: People might be teaching more (especially in the summer); I’m half-half (nursing and exercise science) so we don’t really talk about overloads in nursing. Can you clarify whether this is specifically summertime or more in the spring and fall? CG: Mainly summer. A lot of sections are now consolidated so there are fewer being offered. That’s where the issue is. Do you know if students in the program have been advocating to have more classes available to them over the summer? CG: If there are students, they will offer more sections, so my guess is they have enough sections open for all the students that are interested.

iv. Council Questions for Department Chair (HX) and Dean (RH) and summary of responses: One of the things that stands out is the issue related to adjunct faculty and faculty overloads and general faculty balance, etc. Can you give us some perspective on where things are on the overload issue, # of faculty in the program, whether it’s at an appropriate level, etc? BS: I don’t know that it’s really an issue anymore. Enrollment is down. When we were doing lots of overloads, enrollment was 250; it’s down
Council Discussion and Ratings: Eric Voss made a motion to rate the program In Good Standing. John Foster seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a bundled rollcall vote. Kathryn Brady moved to rate the program Sustainable at Present Enrollment. Amy Winn seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a bundled rollcall vote.

b. Recommendations from ad hoc committee for review of admissions criteria
Kevin Hockenberry (KHock) summarized recommended changes to the admissions criteria proposed by the
committee. Documents with changes tracked are available on Sharepoint.

Highlights of changes:

- Criteria under letter E making testing optional reflects a national trend related to issues of bias in standardized testing. Standardized tests were not seen to be strong predictors of retention and success in college. GPA is a much better indicator. We didn’t want to eliminate testing completely since some students with low GPA might use test scores to show ability, but the recommendation is not to require tests. It’s up to student discretion whether they include test scores in their application.
- The GPA requirement was also raised to be consistent with the temporary policy.
- Illinois law mandates that any Illinois resident in the top 10% of his/her graduating class must be admitted. The committee expanded that to include all states.

KH: There is typically a two-read process with proposals. We can do an expedited process and consider this on one read if the council chooses to do so.

Comments & Questions from CC. CV indicated he had a number of concerns: (1) IB, the last sentence. This sounds like management council will determine all the standards, so the rest of the document is up for interpretation every fall. Can that be clarified? CL: I think the intent is that the policy is reviewed every 3 years regardless. The recommendation for cutoff scores for automatic admission is based on background research. I agree that the language is pretty ambiguous. KH: Can you suggest wording to make it less ambiguous? CV: Maybe add the word “help” to the sentence. (2) Who determines the makeup of the committee the pool who serve on the Admission Review Committee? KH: If you think about operating papers of other committees, this sort of thing is left very open. Responsibility would be to the committee chair. This is consistent with other committees. (3) IIC seems to be a slippery slope. Not all high schools are equal in rigor (and consider home schooling as well), so top 10% isn’t the same. This might be problematic. KH: It seems important to keep this in according to staff working on admissions policies. It helps them see students who have been successful in high school and make the process of admitting them easier, especially if they apply earlier. They didn’t express concerns or problems with it. The committee tried to delete it, but they advocated it should be kept. CL: The top 25% was already in the document and wasn’t part of the consideration in current changes. Top 10% is Illinois law. KH will address with admissions staff. (4) II D, course pattern requirement remedies; Is this a question of needing to transfer these courses in or of taking the courses here before they take other courses? MBW: They can be admitted but have to take these courses to remedy the deficiency from high school. CV: This is confusing wording. The admission requirement states that you HAVE TO have these things to get admitted, but that doesn’t seem to be the case. CL: This isn’t a change in the document it’s a longstanding policy. CV: Can placement tests be used? It might be helpful to say that applicants must complete the course PRIOR TO BECOMING A STUDENT at SIUE. KH: That changes the current policy. They make up the deficits while they’re SIUE students. KH recommends against making changing that are substantive without adequate background information. We can clarify information with admissions people and move forward with that.

Committee members suggested the following editorial changes:

- last sentence in section B: change admissions committee to admissions review committee
- 1B: Add the word “help”.
- 1D: Correct the title from “Associate Chancellor for Institutional Diversity and Inclusion” to “Vice Chancellor for Equity Diversity and Inclusion”.
- 2D, Change the word “applicants” to “students”.

Kelly McGuire moved to accept revisions to document; Kathryn Brady seconded. The motion passed with a majority in a rollcall vote.

Kevin Hock moved to suspend rules to allow a vote on the proposal after only one read; Debbie Sellnow-Richmond seconded; the motion passed with a majority in a rollcall vote.

Eric Voss moved to approve the proposal with revisions; Kevin Cannon seconded. The motion passed with a majority in a rollcall vote. The proposal will be forwarded to FS Executive Committee. KH will forward concerns about the remedy process to Admissions to follow up.

c. 2021-2022 Curriculum Council positions need to be filled. Consider volunteering for these positions or nominating someone.

6. Public Comments
None present.
7. The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 PM by KH, Chair.