**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, December 11, 2019**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Action Item:***

***University Hearing Panel election***

***Beth White, COE, (replacing German Blanco-Lobo) 2018-2020***

***University Appeals Board election***

***Meredith Downes, MQM, (replacement for Justin Vickers) 2019-2022***

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to approve the nominees for the University Hearing Panel and University Appeals Board. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Executive Session***

***Selection of Distinguished Professor***

Senator Horst: The Illinois Open Meetings Act Section 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1) allows for closed meetings to consider the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specificemployees of the public body or legal counsel for the public body.

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to go into Executive Session.

The motion was unanimously approved.

The Senate completed its business in Executive Session and returned to Open Session.

Motion by Senator Qaddour, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to come out of Executive Session. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. So, we are back from Executive Session, and we will have Dr. Selkow—welcome!—come to the table to present the ISU CGS Strategic Consultation Report about our Graduate School, and our graduate education and its future. So, I heard you saying you have slides, but I don’t think that we knew about that beforehand. We need to have that set up…

Dr. Selkow: I said when I was supposed to speak in October. So, I just…

Senator Kalter: Ah. Apparently, that message did not get forwarded to this meeting. We apologize for that. Are you able to go ahead and present without them?

While Dr. Selkow is setting up do you want to give your comments, Senator Horst, about the annual reports? Or are you talking about the consultation report?

Senator Horst: Are we moving on to the annual reports?

Senator Kalter: I’m giving Dr. Selkow some time to set up.

***Advisory Item:***

***Annual report, Faculty Review Committee, 2018-2019, Redacted***

***Annual report, University Review Committee, 2018-2019***

***Annual report, Ombudsperson Council Report 2018***

Senator Horst: I was just wondering regarding the Ombudsperson Report, I was wondering, they did this… this year they did approximate their hours, and I remember when the Faculty Affairs Committee looked at this a couple years ago we asked for that. I was wondering if these hours are per week, or per semester, or what kind of… five hours on cases and training. Is that for the whole year? Or a week? What is that?

Senator Kalter: That would be… So, I think, either myself or Dr. Murphy would be the only people able to answer that, but since we’re not the Ombudspeople we wouldn’t know for sure. But, since this is an annual report, they are talking about the entire year. In other words they say, “An additional three cases that occurred in 2018 are considered resolved” etc. “Dr. Schneider reports working approximately 12 hours on various cases, Elkins for 5 hours, and Crubaugh for 6.”

Senator Horst: Yeah. I would just say that number, the low number was surprising to me given that they’re given a course release.

Provost Murphy: I would agree. I think we had that conversation, and I can’t disagree with you on that.

Senator Horst: I think I spend five hours on Senate material a week, regularly.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: We talked about that briefly. You had to leave the Executive Committee meeting where we sort of briefly talked about that.

Provost Murphy: I would agree. Something to look at and review so.

Senator Kalter: The problems obviously are apparent. One is that years can go up and down like this, so you can have this many hours one year and an enormous amount of hours in a different year. And obviously since we have a Council made up of two faculty and one staff person that… and we try to make sure the faculty are from different departments, or I’m sorry, different colleges, that leaves people who really need faculty Ombudspeople with few choices if we reduce those numbers. But it is also a question of whether they get a course release, and whether they always get it, or whether they only sometimes receive them. Any other comments on the annual reports?

All right, again, apologies, Dr. Selkow for that message not having been forwarded from the October meeting. And actually, apologies for having had to cancel your presentation at the October meeting, or the first October meeting. Are you ready?

Dr. Selkow: We’re almost there.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

***ISU CGS Strategic Consultation Report presented by Dr. Noelle Selkow***

Dr. Selkow: Well, thank you all for letting me come and speak today. I am serving as the Interim Director of the Graduate School; I’m coming up on a year. I started in January. In fall of 2018, the Graduate School, under the direction of Dr. Amy Hurd, had two consultants come on campus. We are members of the Council of Graduate Schools and as members we are able to have an opportunity to have consultants come on campus, and sort of look at the Graduate School and basically its role on the campus. Prior to them coming in fall of 2018, Dr. Hurd had conducted a Strategic Plan with the Graduate School, and that was several constituents on campus that included students, graduate coordinators, faculty, Provost staff, I’m not entirely sure of every group that she met as I was a grad coordinator at the time. And so, from the Strategic Plan, she felt that it was necessary to look at a consulting report, and really see where the Graduate School fits within the university. So, I’m here today to deliver those recommendations.

You all should have received the report, and again, I just want to stress that these are the recommendations of the consultants. I’m here today to really gather information and feedback based on those recommendations, so that we can move forward. I’ve created a task force within the Graduate Council to sort of look at all these recommendations from different groups that we are talking to, to sort of come together with a memo, again, based on these recommendations, and really what we think the University feels should be the moving forward of the Graduate School.

So, just to begin I wanted to talk a little bit about the current organizational structure of the Provost office. All of the AVP’s report to her, as well as the college deans and the dean of Milner Library. Where the Graduate School sits is we are under the AVP of Research and Graduate Studies, along with the different centers on campus, including Stevenson Center and CeMaST, the Cross Endowed Chair, Research and Sponsored Programs, and Research, Ethics, and Compliance.

So, this current role within the Graduate School is there is a Director of the Graduate School that reports to the AVP of Research and Graduate Studies; under the Director is an Associate Director, and under her are two admission processors that we have housed in the Graduate School. We have a Coordinator of Faculty Services, a Coordinator of Student Services, as of Monday an Outreach and Funding Coordinator. We also have four GAs. We have a copyright librarian that is housed within the Graduate School, and then we have one and a half graduate processors through the Registrar’s office. The copyright librarian, the 1.5 graduate processors, our two admission processors, and actually the associate director are actually not budgeted lines within the Graduate School.

As I mentioned, in fall of 2018, two consultants came to campus for two days and met with various constituents on campus to gather feedback and information just really about the graduate education and the Graduate School structure in the University. The report, as I mentioned, outlines their recommendations based on best practices from the Council of Graduate Schools along with their role as Graduate School Deans on their campus.

So, I’m going to go through what I thought were the main recommendations, certainly there were some others that I didn’t feel necessary to address, either because we’ve already addressed them, or they really weren’t pertinent to the larger conversation. But the first recommendation that they mentioned was the position of the Graduate School, mainly the title of the position. They recommend that it should be an Associate Vice President or a Dean of Graduate Education, and their highest recommendation is a dean. This would allow for regular interaction with the other deans on campus, and be a resource for strategic planning, and to be aware of new initiatives that are occurring at the collegiate level. The consultant had sensed a hesitation to create another administrative position, but when the consultants met with faculty, they seem to be in full support of that change in title. They recommended that if this change was not possible that there be a change in bylaws, bylaws in committee and council structure, so that the Director of the Graduate School would have regular interaction with the deans and others on campus. Part of their explanation for that in that was that in almost every meeting with the focus groups, there were below statements, and these were all quoted, “The importance of graduate education on campus is already communicated by the fact that the lead person is a director and not a dean.” “Our institution focuses solely on undergraduate education; why else would Dr. Hurd not be a Dean.” “We have an Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, but only a Director of the Graduate School.” “Amy Hurd is not a dean like she would be on other campuses.” “The person in charge of undergraduate education is an Associate Provost, and does not, for instance, report to the Associate Provost for Enrollment Management.” “The Graduate School is powerless.”

In focus groups with the deans, many of the deans were not in attendance. They either sent other representation from their office, such as an associate dean or a faculty member, or there was no representation at all. To the consultants, this sense that the Graduate School was secondary to undergraduate education. That graduate education is not central to college admissions, college course offerings are scheduled last, and graduate assistantships are often eliminated first with budget cuts. The advocate for graduate education on campus should be seated to have direct conversations with education leaders such as Provosts, and deans.

The second recommendation they had was a centralized model. Admission processors should be monitoring the departmental checklists. There should be addition of staff, such as a communications specialist or a publication writer; degree auditor should be moved to the Graduate School. They had also recommended a process for new graduate degrees, which would require strategic planning, understanding the strategic planning cycle of the colleges, and to promote accelerated, hybrid, online, and certificate options. And some of the explanation for that is that graduate admissions was moved to the Graduate School about almost two years ago, now in February, so that is now sort of starting to move to a centralized model. We’re also using Slate, and the deans that came for the consulting report were familiar with that interface, and they know how robust it is for processing. They felt that there should be a communications staff person. Right now, we really rely heavily on a graduate assistant, and as we know, they cannot work as many hours as a full time staff member, and turnover limits a consistent voice across campus, and then also to have this person build relationships with campus constituents. Now we have been approved, and as I mentioned, our full time staff position that started on Monday is helping with that.

They had recommended that the processes in the Registrar’s office should move reporting lines to the Graduate School to help centralize the efforts, for similar reasons that grad admissions was moved, and this could help monitor time to degree, and barriers to completion. And then the other explanation is that there seems to be more of a top down approach in strategic planning. At the time, the President had unveiled a new strategic plan and the colleges were asked to follow. There’s limited communication with the Graduate School, or there is no mention of new graduate programs within those strategic plans. The program format is typically a sole decision on the program or the college not necessarily coming from the Graduate School, and there are inconsistencies for dual degree programs across colleges.

Another recommendation was improving graduate student retention rates. They suggested having an on-campus, instead of a virtual new student orientation. Departments with retention and time to degree issues need to be identified. An adoption of a degree audit software specifically for graduate education. Identify best practices in graduate education, and eliminate barriers to success. Expand workshop offering and include master level students. Communication about Graduate School offerings needs to improve. Utilize campus partners to help with workshops, and hold a Graduate Student Appreciation Week. The explanation for that is that graduate student experiences vary across programs and program infrastructure, course offerings and funding is often different across the colleges and leads to time to degree issues. Professional development is not consistently provided by different graduate programs. The graduate student body and faculty do not know about offerings by the graduate school. Mentoring is often left to an individual advisor that often has limited professional development for mentoring. It’s hard to have discussions on overall Graduate School experiences, such as funding, writing assistance, administration, values, and they felt that the administration values undergraduate education more because we have not established really a survey for that.

As I mentioned, some of these recommendations have been addressed.

And the last recommendation to discuss was the graduation funding practices. There should be more of a systematic review of graduate assistantship lines within and across colleges. There should be a raise in our graduate student’s stipends. They had recommended eliminating our .25 FTE GA positions to include tuition and external grant applications. Hire an external fellowship coordinator. Work with University Advancement to obtain private sector funding. And create an advisory board of alums and members of the public. And their explanation for that is GA allocation should be based on key metrics, and evaluated on an annual basis at the Provost level, or at least have metrics of accountability. .25 FTE GA positions allow for more students to have tuition waivers, but does not support cost of living, may leave to time to degree and persistence issues. External Funding Coordinator can help find funding for students to offset costs, significant opportunities for graduate students; again the person we had hired on Monday will be helping with that. By using private sector funding to some of the graduate programs, such as our 3MT competition, and the University Research Symposium, money could be freed up to go to other initiatives, and an advisory board would help advocate for graduate education.

And that is what I had planned to present to you. So, I am open to take comments, or to elaborate a little bit more on any of the recommendations, or certainly hear your thoughts on what graduate education should look like on campus.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. And I should have added, by the way, if you will send us your slides we can send them around afterwards. Do we have questions, comment, feedback?

Senator Meyers: Are you… I’m curious to know if the recommendations that you chose to highlight just now are ones that you’re planning to pursue?

Dr. Selkow: They are. I would say these are the majority of them. The only other things that really weren’t included were some of the structural… some of the things that we have addressed, such as some of the communications. So, we have a weekly newsletter that we’re sending out. But these are the recommendations that we are trying to pursue.

Senator Meyers: So, are you planning to have dialogue with units and programs on things like the elimination of the .25 GA, because that would be a big challenge for my department.

Dr. Selkow: Right. And I would say, remember, these are recommendations. We’re trying to figure out what’s feasible. When I did meet with our students, they did not support the elimination of a .25 GA, and that is not something I would be looking forward to eliminate. There are students who actually do want that option and opportunity. So, that is a note that I have made that that is not what we’re looking for. The plan is that after meeting with, I think our last group are deans, and I will be meeting with them at the beginning of spring, and we will write up a memo, white paper, whatever you want to call it, based on these recommendations and then we’ll have open forums for feedback if there’s a structural change, certainly that’s going to need to be talked to through Senate and then the Presidential cabinet.

Provost Murphy: One of the things I’ve asked Dr. Selkow and the Grad Council is as you meet with various groups, as you review these recommendations, you know, I think this will be my last semester as a Provost, we’ll have a new Provost, and so this would be good white paper instead of recommendations to make to an incoming Provost to think about structural changes. But again, it needs to have… you know, they have a communication plan, and a plan for lots of forums, so that we really can gather good feedback from all across the campus, and all of our faculty who are involved in graduate studies and working with graduate students, but also graduate students themselves who can give us some good input.

Senator Mainieri: I think that the recommendations from the report really echo my experience with graduate education and the status of grad education here on this campus, and particularly when we’re thinking about enrollment issues across… numbers across our campus. I think the grad program is an area that can really contribute to those enrollment concerns. And so, I support many of the recommendations that increase the status and visibility of grad education here at ISU. We have wonderful grad programs and I feel like their story just isn’t told. And that would include support for consideration of the dean or AVP transition. I guess my question in regard to that would be, if they gave you any more information about what they saw as the pros and cons for dean versus AVP? And then if it were a dean, then as a dean, it would report directly to the Provost? Is that how the line would work? Could you just talk a little bit more about that?

Dr. Selkow: I believe their recommendation for an AVP or a dean is really to give this person more direct access to the Provost, or direct reporting line. As of right now, the person who’s the advocate for graduate education (the director) is expressing those concerns to the AVP of Research and Graduate Studies, who is then advocating to the Provost or at the deans table. And then, to also be with the deans, and again, their highest recommendation is for it to be a dean, again, based on our bylaws, then that dean would sit in with Deans Council and have a regular interaction with them. And I think part of that is they were actually pretty surprised that the strategic planning, only one college lists graduate education in their strategic plan, and that’s a problem. And so, this person could sit with the strategic plan, and make sure that graduate education is advocated for.

Senator Mainieri: Great. I have a follow-up to that. I think one of the things that stood out to me in the report was them highlighting the AVP of Undergrad Education, right. And I certainly support the idea of a dean position, but I don’t think it actually addresses that in terms of, we add an AVP for Grad Education. I know that it’s within Research, AVP for Research and Grad Programs, but does that mean that the Grad Programs part of the AVP for Research would then go away, and then we don’t have Grad Programs represented at all at the AVP level?

Dr. Selkow: There’s a common structure, is that it would be an AVP of Research and Dean of the Graduate School is that one person. Or you could have an AVP of Research and Graduate Studies and a Dean of the Graduate School, that really would be very similar to the current structure that we have. There have been talks that Research and Grad could end up breaking off. Our research profile certainly has increased on this University, that is, again, kind of tug-of-warring with Graduate Studies as well. And so really making sure that both are being advocated for by an appropriate person, and so if it were an AVP of Graduate Studies, I think that would be on its own. But there would then have to be further discussions of splitting then Research from Graduate Studies.

Senators Horst: Provost Murphy, can you refresh our memories if we are doing a search for the Director of Graduate Studies, and if we are not, do you anticipate figuring out this title change before that search is initiated?

Provost Murphy: Thank you. That’s a good question. We decided to hold off on conducting the search for the Director of Graduate Studies, and Dr. Selkow has agreed to stay on another year in an interim. Really, the main reason that started that is because we didn’t want to be search the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at the same time we were searching the Director of Graduate Studies. But then, once we got this consultant’s report, it just feels like that’s the right decision anyway. It gives the Grad Council, and it gives our graduate faculty more time to really digest these recommendations.

Senator Horst: Thank you.

Senator Mainieri: I may have missed this in the report, so I apologize, as part of the funding practices, I wonder… I know the funding for the Grad School is kind of a weird beast (from what I understand). And so I’m wondering if there were any recommendations for making sure that the Grad School budget is more solid, so that the dean or director (however that plays out) can actually move forward intentionally, and I wonder if any of that came up?

Dr. Selkow: It’s sort of an underline or an indirect, so that’s really what the centralization recommendation from the Graduate Schools. So, currently the Graduate School is funded under indirect costs. We actually… we’re tied in with our budget under Research as well. And so that’s our funding model. We don’t have a hard budget right now. So, by centralizing funds, essentially what they would mean is really funds that are going to the colleges for graduate assistantships would essentially then be housed within the Graduate School, and a new funding model would need to be established, to then distribute those funds to the college. Graduate assistantships would then stay housed centrally within the Graduate School. There’s a lot of inconsistencies in what graduate assistants are being paid across campus for 20 hours, 10 hours of work. And so that could be, again, part of centralizing those funds, and really evaluate how assistantships are being funded, modeled, how each department or college is distributing them, and if it’s centralized, then there’s a little bit more, I don’t want to say control, but there’s a little bit… again, just more of a centralized way of understand how funding is being distributed and using a different model to award those funds.

Senator Torry: So, my question’s regarding the INTO program, and the oversight of the Graduate School in the INTO program. My understand right now is these students coming in through INTO do not have the same application process that the Graduate School will require for any other student. I think that’s going to cause a problem. Being a faculty member who has INTO students, I don’t see their GRE scores. I don’t see their transcripts. I don’t even get a letter of why they want to work with me. It’s an arranged marriage and I’m an unwilling bride, in a lot of these. I like the INTO program, but the Graduate School needs to have oversight so that the faculty know who these students… I have no idea who these students are. They show up, and I’m their advisor in theory. I’m not even their advisory on paper. I can’t pull my Digital Measures, I’m an advisory, yet I’m doing the work, the master’s thesis, the course registration, I’m advising INTO how to register these kids to get through my program. The Graduate School needs to step in so that I (faculty) at least have some knowledge of the students I’m getting. It’s an arranged marriage and I’m an unwilling bride in a lot of these cases.

(Pause)

Senator Mainieri: Sorry, I have lots of questions. I think this is my last comment. Under the leadership of Amy Hurd, and then you’ve continued Dr. Selkow in hosting events that have brought faculty together from across grad programs, and I’ve been surprised to learn about the variation in practices across grad programs, whether that be compensation, or course releases, for coordinators, or grad directors within programs, or GA practices. So, I certainly support more coordination in centralization while maintaining autonomy, and maintaining the differing needs of the differing programs. And that’s going to be, I think, a delicate balance. And certainly as you move forward through the input process, I think, a lot of us would have some input on what things would… we would feel strongly about needing to remain… the autonomy of the units, and the things that we could really use some better support, and consistency across campus.

Senator Horst: I would like to support Senator Torry’s comments about INTO. In Music, in particular, because we have one-on-one instruction with graduate students once a week; it’s basically 10% of my load. And with INTO people coming in, we had to make a decision on their applications separate from the decisions about the bigger pool, and we really can only support two or three graduate students period. And so we were… the INTO situation is awkward. I know that… I’ve been discussing it with other people, and they said, well, you can opt out, but we can’t really assess what the pool is going to look like as a total mass, unless we have all of the sorts of applicants together.

Senator Kalter: Further Comments? (Pause) As you have probably guessed, I have a number of them. So, I’m going to piggy back on a couple of things that Senator Mainieri said. One of them had to do with the dean part. Because I kind of got the feeling reading this report that the word “dean” had a semantic difference among the… between the universities that these reviewers came from and our University, and I didn’t quite see what the importance of actually calling someone a dean would be versus having them at the AVP level. You know, why can’t they meet with our deans, and not be called a dean, for example, right, be called an AVP? And in that way, I felt like in the first couple of pages where they were talking about meetings and reporting lines, the reporting lines seemed less important than the meetings, and the communications. So, that was the first thing.

I also wanted to echo what Senator Mainieri had just said about autonomy, because I think there are a couple of places where there are sort of cautions I would throw out. Putting the Director of the Grad School in charge of certain kinds of admissions decisions, and especially it was talking about in terms of exceptions to admissions. I think that could be very good, it could also shut down diversity and inclusion, and a lot of other things, and also take admissions decisions out of the local, which is where we usually want them to be. The other part of that was when they were talking about online and hybrid decisions. Yes. I absolutely think that that should be done in consultation with the Provost office. But that, again, I think our ethic here of having that be a local decision has always been a very good one.

Couple questions that I had, and I’m not sure whether you can answer this yet, but there were the places where they said, well, some of the colleges do not emphasis graduate education, and didn’t send their deans to the meeting. Now I wonder if that was a scheduling issue, maybe the dean was out of the country or something like that. And then, there were other places where they said students are having problems completing degrees. I wonder if we have, since the report came out, done a better inventory of where those are, and what the reasons might be for the first one, because I can think of some good reasons why people might emphasis undergrad versus grad. And whether we’ve sort of located the places where the students are having trouble completing, because I know we do a little bit of that in program review.

Dr. Selkow: To go back to the meeting with the deans, I believe if the deans couldn’t be there they did reach out to Amy, so she was a little caught off guard by that comment as well. To her, it didn’t seem to be because there was some communications, and it was a scheduling. Regarding time to degree, we are aware of programs that tend to take a little longer for our students. We have expressed some of those concerns. We’re trying to work through… trying to figure out where maybe some of the bottlenecks are: is it in course work, is it once they have completed their comprehensive exams. I would say most of it is in our PhD programs, which we have ten of them. So, really trying to find out where: is it bottleneck in course work, is it at the comp exam, is it once they’ve completed that comp exam and they’re sort of in their dissertation hours. But we have students (which is shocking) that have over 100 hours of dissertation, because of our continuous enrollment policy. So, we are looking… we’re looking into that, looking to see if we can make changes to some of those things, but we are working with programs to try to help with that time to degree.

Senators Kalter: That’s interesting. I know in our PhD program, we did something where we changed our comps, which we thought was going to be a good change, and I think it had an inadvertent effect of lengthening time to degree for our doctoral students. I also, just for some reason this occurs to me that it’s interesting to me that in my doctoral program, I received course credit for teaching, but we don’t do that here (as far as I know) with our graduate students. So even though in the English department, in Com, and in some places like Math and Biology, students are spending an awful lot of time here serving our undergraduates, and serving our programs, but they get incredibly skimpy pay, and no college credit. You know, I’m not sure whether that’s significant or not, but I know that we as a department when we hire in are looking for people who have teaching experience, and so.

So a couple of other things that I wrote down, there was a place in the report where the people who met with the student focus groups were surprised that they were talking about one thing and not the other. And I thought, well, I wonder how we are addressing those things that the students wanted to talk about, and they were funding, writing skills, and the campus climate. Now, it seemed to me in general that the report a little bit overemphasized communication, because I think the main reason why graduate education is seen as not as emphasized as much as undergraduate education is funding. That we are, you know, we’re seeing our graduate stipends constantly, constantly decreasing relative to everybody else and just in general, and then we don’t have enough of them, and without that funding, I don’t think that all of the communication experts in the world will help us to turn the campus climate around, and to turn… for the students or for the faculty perception. But I was specifically interested, because the report kind of addresses funding a little bit, and kind of addresses campus climate a little bit, where we are with assisting students on writing skills that are interfering with their time to degree.

Dr. Selkow: That is what is consistently brought up as well. So, we have a Graduate School Advisory Council made up of about 15 students from all different units on campus (masters, doctoral, part time, full time), and I know that this has been an issue. I have found out that there was actually a partnership with the Visor Center and English that sort of went away, and I’ve had it resurfaced, and I have met with the Visor Center and the English department, and we have changed a job description, and there will be two full time graduate students in the Visor Center helping graduate students specifically. It’s challenging because of the different writing styles and the formats for theses and dissertation. Again, this will help with some general writing for our graduate students. We are seeing a lot of students internationally who need help, and we need to provide for these students. So, this is at least a step until we can get possibly a graduate student writing center, a graduate student space, but I’m trying to do what I can to listen to those concerns. The Graduate School is funding those positions due to, fortunately, money that’s not being used by the colleges to help with some recruitment of students, and I feel that this is an issue that will help all of our students, and I felt that that is a good use of our funds.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I will say, I think that our department (and I’m not one of the experts in this area), but I think that we see issues with writing skills support on both the undergraduate and the graduate level, and perhaps a kind of, even though we don’t speak in this language, a not following best practices kind of model, needing to have more collaboration with University College, more collaboration with the Grad School, and definitely more funding for that.

The last two comments I had, one of them had to do with, they were talking about, in terms of funding models, how it’s important for us to start actually looking at the distribution of GAships and how we do that. One of the comments I would make about that (a sub-comment about that), is I hope we don’t do around robbing from the rich to give to the poor, because in my view the rich are really lower middle class at this institution. So, if we do this only as a redistribution of where the GAships are, it’s only going to cause, and aggravate, problems rather than solving them. But it seemed to me that the two sorts of models that they put out, alone, neither one of them works very well. I didn’t understand quite why they couldn’t be combined in some way. So, one of them was emphasizing sort of the performance metrics for a program, which I thought had some problematic things in them, you know, like, how do you measure productivity in various departments, across departments? But still, performance is important. And then, the other one was essentially how are we providing for our undergraduates, which of course gets back into the rhetoric of we always put undergraduate education first, and yet is still a very important metric, right. To look at, we should be distributing GAships so that we can have our undergraduates understand how to write, and how to communicate, and how to do math skills, and that kind of thing.

So, that was my first comment, and the second one, or my last one, has to do with the Engineering programs. And that is that we need to be really seriously thinking about what is Engineering going to look like on this campus when we realize that it really is going to be not very feasible just to do it as undergraduate programs. I don’t know, I mean I’m not the expert in the room for sure here, but it seems to me that every Engineering program I’ve ever met has a very important graduate program attached to it. And so, I’m hoping that we’re modeling that as we look at those programs, partly because we know that the graduate programs cost, but that’s exactly why we need to put that into the cost model, and start envisioning the various pathways there. All right. Any other discussion, any other comments or feedback? (Pause)

All right. I think it might still be an early night. I want to just go back, thank you so much Dr. Selkow for coming in. And again, I apologize, I’m not sure where the message got lost, but we’ll send your slides around.

I want to just go back for a second to the Advisory Items (the annual reports) just to make sure that nobody thought of any comments or questions as we were looking through the other item. (Pause) And if not, do we have a motion to adjourn?

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Qaddour, seconded by Senator Lucey, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.