MINUTES

Present: Gay Miller, Chair; Susan Curtis, Bettina Francis, Phillip Geil, Gary Kling, Danielle Maynard, Randy McCarthy, Eric Meyer, Steven Michael, Isabel Molina, Stephanie Sowl, Jeremy Tyson, Pratap Vanka, Michelle Wander

ex officio: William Buttlar, Karen Carney, Kristi Kuntz, Faye Lesht

Guests: Associate Chancellor and Vice Provost for Budgets and Resource Planning Michael Andrechak, Assistant Provost and Director of the Division of Management Information Amy Edwards, Associate Registrar Rodney Hoewing, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Barbara Wilson

A regular meeting of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC) was called to order at 1:10 pm on Monday, October 7, 2013 in room 232 English Building with Chair Gay Miller presiding.

1. Introductions
Guests were introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes from September 9, 2013 were approved as written.

   (B. Wilson and M. Andrechak)
Wilson distributed printed Campus Strategic Plan booklets. There are four main goals: 1) Foster scholarship, discovery, and innovation, 2) Provide transformative learning experiences including undergraduate research experiences, international experience, and leadership courses, 3) Make significant and visible societal impact, and 4) Steward current resources and generate additional resources for strategic investment including dollars generated from self-supported and cost-recovery academic programs. The state is an unreliable partner at this point so there is a challenge for departments to come up with new resources without deviating too far from their core missions.

If a department wants to add a program or service, costs as well as capacity must be considered. It is unrealistic to think there are absolutely no costs to adding a program or service. If programs or services are to be added, a department should also state what it will stop doing so as to add capacity. The previous add-on model that we have grown accustomed to at Illinois is no longer feasible. Drastic reductions are not necessary, but strategic planning is required. Colleges and departments are being challenged to play to their strengths and to not try to accomplish everything. Instead, they need to put resources in the areas where they can be exceptional and make the most impact by building upon existing programs and services; the focus should be on creating depth and strength rather than breadth.

EPC can assist in meeting goals by being nimble. There are often comments made by faculty about how the campus takes too long time to complete initiatives. Helping units meet their goals in a timely fashion should be the goal, but there should not be an automatic approval of everything that is proposed. There has to be a balance between acting quickly and over analyzing.

EPC can also focus on asking questions that will result in more informative responses regarding budget implications. When EPC reviews proposals, the undergraduate student experience, and not just the graduate experience, should also be considered.

Obtaining additional resources will be crucial for the campus. The University’s funding model is changing. Chair Miller noted that this is the first time tuition provides more dollars than state appropriations. Wilson added that how the University is structured is being carefully reviewed.
Sometimes departments have been split into such small areas that it is difficult to find synergy. Interdisciplinary work is definitely encouraged, but on a virtual level without building additional costly infrastructure.

Wilson reported that there is an effort to widely distribute the Campus Strategic Plan to everyone on campus. Wilson responded to a question regarding monitoring the progress of goals by stating that a campus retreat with deans and faculty leaders is held every year that addresses this issue. During the retreat, progress is reviewed concerning how well we are achieving the goals that have been set.

Andrechak conveyed to the EPC that states across the nation are disinvesting in higher education. The state of Illinois does not have the capacity to continue funding the University. Pension costs likely will be passed on to the University or the state will cut our budget. The University has to look at new sources of revenue and new ways to better invest University resources.

Units will need to increase their focus on resource generation. There is an institutional responsibility to provide doctoral education. There needs to be a differentiation between PhD and terminal master’s training. Currently, undergraduate tuition provides a large portion of funding for this training. Without cost recovery, undergraduate students will continue to cover the cost of terminal master’s training. Not only should generating revenue be a focus, but the costs should appropriately be assigned to the graduate student instead of passing the costs on to undergraduate students.

The vast majority of Graduate revenue flows to colleges. However, most doctoral revenue is waived and almost all self-supporting revenue is collected. Colleges have discretion regarding how revenue is passed to units.

Self-supporting programs (revenue generating programs) have the potential to create costs in other units. In response to this potential, budget guidelines have been modified to require payment to other units. There is a need for discussion between units to determine these costs. Tuition remission usually goes to the college, and will continue to go to the home college.

The analysis shows no significant impact over the past five years. The cross-unit impact will continue to be monitored and analyzed going forward. Overall, there has been no graduate student growth in instructional units (IUs) taken in other colleges, and self-supporting IUs from other colleges remains flat.

Concern about the maintenance of excellence was expressed by a committee member. Andrechak responded that the University must look at maintaining excellence overall. The number of smaller classes (i.e., classes with 20 or less students) has significantly increased. These smaller classes are not Discovery courses, which have seen a decline in enrollment. Instead, the main areas where we have sought to decrease class sizes are in writing, language, and public speaking. Wilson added that in the past, because of budget cuts, these classes had grown in size. Yet, pedagogically, these types of skill-oriented classes require smaller sections to be successful for students. A member of the committee asked about large classes. Edwards responded that the number of classes with over 50 students has stayed relatively steady.

Andrechak mentioned the decline in tenured streamed faculty, and that it is most likely a short-term trend. The campus is now in the midst of multiple years of aggressive faculty hiring so faculty numbers will grow. Wilson also noted that the faculty/student ratios are taken into consideration when hiring faculty members. Andrechak added that faculty members must not exclusively hire based on undergraduate students, but that it is a significant factor. Taking ratios into consideration ensures that hiring will be done in departments where there is a clear need for more faculty members.
4. **Chair’s Remarks** (G. Miller)
Chair Miller noted that the government shut-down is influencing classroom and other educational activities. Projects in courses that require government data are unable to be completed. Also, due to the lapse in government funding, National Science Foundation (NSF) websites and business applications, including NSF.gov, FastLane, and Research.gov are unavailable.

5. **Office of the Provost Updates** (K. Kuntz)
Kuntz reported one administrative approval. The department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering are updating required courses based on restrictions on classes outside the unit. Previously required courses are no longer available for out-of-the-unit student enrollment.

Kuntz also noted that the four new proposals that were just posted to the EPC website include use of the old proposal form. The additional information on the revised proposal form regarding budget implications may not be included in the proposal. The subcommittee will need to ask for the additional budget information if needed until the new proposal form is approved.

6. **Graduate College Updates** (B. Buttlar)
Buttlar reported no administrative approvals. Buttlar distributed printed copies of the 2012-2013 Graduate College Year in Review booklet. He noted that one-fourth of the campus is comprised of graduate students. Buttlar gave a quick overview of items included in the Year in Review booklet. The booklet contains numerous dashboard statistics.

Vanka voiced his concern that graduate research fellowships seem to be reactive rather than proactive. Buttlar responded that Graduate College Director of External Fellowships, Ken Vickery, has grown training activities to help students with essays and other required items. These training opportunities should help address concerns.

Buttlar also reported that a record number of NSF (National Science Foundation) Graduate Research Fellowships (GRF) were awarded to University of Illinois graduate students this year (45 awards from applications submitted by Illinois students, 34 students using the fellowships to study at the University of Illinois, which is double the previous record). Deba Dutta, Dean of the Graduate College, stated that Illinois will continue to work as a campus to increase the number of GRFs awarded to this campus. Dean Dutta believes a campus of this size and stature could potentially receive up to 75 new GRFs annually.

7. **Old Business**

   A. **Subcommittee C**: Steve Michael, Chair; Juan Bernal, Bill Buttlar, Matthew Hill, Kristi Kuntz, Isabel Molina, Jeremy Tyson, Michelle Wander

   i. **EP.14.07** Proposal from the College of Business to permanently establish the Center for Business and Public Policy

      Michael invited proposal sponsor and Center for Business and Public Policy Director Jeffrey Brown to speak about the Center. The Center was created 6 or 7 years ago in the College of Business. Businesses operate with government involvement and we haven’t been providing that piece to our students. Have been working on a collaborative effort to offer more courses to

      Michael moved approved of EP.14.07. Meyer inquired about the effect if the deferred donor rescinds funding. Center Director Brown replied that the Center is working to acquire funding from multiple sources to fund individual pieces instead of the entire Center. A signed agreement is in place, but the agreement is not irrevocable.

      Proposal EP.14.07 was approved, with no objections, and no abstentions pending minor revisions. One revision includes adding language stating that the proposal is not creating a Center, but rather establishing the Center’s permanency. Brown was encouraged to
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attend the Senate meeting on October 21, and will provide the minor revisions before the October 15 Senate packet deadline.

B. Revised EPC Proposal Form (G. Miller & K. Kuntz)

Kuntz updated the proposal form to include comments from the previous EPC meeting. Meyer inquired why the form does not ask the same questions as the IBHE (Illinois Board of Higher Education) form. Kuntz replied that only a small sub-set of proposals are required to complete the IBHE form. McCarthy moved approval of the revised EPC Proposal Form. The motion was seconded and approved with no objections and one abstention. Kuntz will provide a finalized version of the revised EPC Proposal Form for posting to the EPC website.

C. Revision to Standing Rule 13 – Formation, Termination, Separation, Transfer, Merger, Change in Status, or Renaming of Units

i. Academic Program Data (A. Edwards)

Edwards distributed samples of data indicating significant changes in undergraduate and graduate programs over the past several years. The data represents a quick snapshot of how a program has grown or declined over the past several years. Graduate program data includes admission rates, but the undergraduate data does not. Both the graduate and undergraduate data samples use purple highlighting to indicate programs that have increased drastically. Red represents a drastic decrease in a program. Yellow highlighting of a program indicates that further investigation of a decrease is warranted. And white, or no highlighting, indicates no significant increase or decrease. Graduate data includes the admission rate. An increase in applicants may not necessarily specify an increase in the admission rate. The program might not have the capacity to respond to the increase in applicants due to resource restrictions.

This data needs the addition of knowing the story behind each data set. Hoewing added that in code book, there are comments that indicated that program X is closing down and changing to program Y. Analyzing the data is manual due to all of the nuances that the numbers alone cannot represent.

Undergraduate programs did not consider admission data. Out of 352 programs, fall enrollment numbers show that 37 programs had drastic increases, 47 showed a drastic decrease, and 35 warranted further investigation of decreases. There are 420 graduate programs. Only 6 programs showed a drastic increase, 21 programs had a drastic decrease, and 20 warranted further investigation of decreases. The inclusion of admission rates in the graduate data helps show a better picture. McCarthy noted that if only the last 3 years are considered, some of the programs would not be included in the drastic increase or drastic decrease category. Kuntz added that some of the programs included that go from 0 to a very large number are due to name changes.

8. New Business

Miller reminded the committee that the Center/Institute proposal form was under review last year and needs to be finalized. Two elements to be included on the form are an indication of the status of the center/institute, temporary or permanent, and an indication that the proposal is for the creation of an institute or a center. Miller, Francis, Geil and Kuntz will review the Center/Institute proposal form and present their recommendations to the full EPC.

Kuntz noted that the Center for Environmental Sustainability (CSE) plans to submit a proposal to change the name of the unit. The consensus of the EPC indicated that CSE should complete the regular EPC proposal form in place of the lengthy Center/Institute proposal form as the only change is the name of the unit.
9. **Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 2:51 pm.

Jenny Roether
Clerk of the Senate