

## 2017 Graduate Council

### Meeting Minutes

November 2, 2017

**Members Present:** Clay Awsumb, Michael Brown, Wesley Calvert, Norman Carver, Saran Donahoo, Buffy Ellsworth, Themistoklis Haniotakis, Karen Jones, Sajal Lahiri, Jordan Maddox, Derrick McDowell, Marc Morris, Julie Partridge, Sue Rimmer, Lauran Schaefer, Joseph Shapiro, Jennifer Lynn Smith, Kenneth Stickers, Tomás Velasco, Rachel Whaley.

**Members Absent:** William Babcock, Trish McCubbin, and Greg Rose.

**Proxies:** Johnathan Flowers for Sheena Hart and Thomas Shaw for Richard McKinnies.

**Ex-Officio:** Lizette Chevalier, Terry Clark, David DiLilla, James Garvey, Yueh-Ting Lee, Grant Miller, and Carlo Montemagno.

**Guests:** Susan Babbitt, Michelle Chitambar, Steven Esling, Mark Peterson, and John Russell.

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:04 AM.

#### Consideration of Minutes:

Spelling corrections “Jonathan” to “Johnathan” Flowers and “COSA” to “CASA” (in two locations).

Change in wording: “R Whaley responded that then the ‘regardless of when the exam was taken’ should be taken out” to “R Whaley responded that the ‘regardless of when the exam was taken’ language should remain.”

Graduate Council members voted to approve the minutes for the meeting held October 5, 2017—25 in favor. The minutes passed.

#### Remarks—Chancellor Carlo Montemagno

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that it was a busy time and that the reorganization was moving along smartly. His office received over 300 thoughtful comments and suggested modifications to the plan, all of which he has read. Changes to the plan have been made based on the input received. Those changes will be released in concert to everyone around the 17th of November. He said he would also be meeting in person with several different faculty groups next week, because there is some bifurcation between faculty groups and what they believe that they need. Otherwise the plan is proceeding as hoped. The community is fully engaged and actively participating in reformulating/redesigning the future for SIU.

**D McDowell** indicated that the student population at the School of Law was generally pleased with those new initiatives for the program. He said change is necessary in making SIU one of the best programs in the Midwest; however, he felt it was important to bring to the Chancellor’s attention that in regards to raising incoming LSAT scores, many of the leading, current students came in on the very scores that are to be changed or raised. He then gave a personal example of his success not based on the LSAT score. He said that the practice of Law is just that, practice. It goes beyond the original testing to the hard work and persistence of individuals in honing a craft over a lifetime. He then asked that the Chancellor take into consideration factors other than initial testing that indicate student success.

**Chancellor Montemagno** congratulated D McDowell on his success. He added that the direction he gave did not specify a score cut off. The direction was to reassert the quality of the students in the program and make sure that the students coming in have a high chance of success in the program and after.

**C Awsumb** said that he believed that there was some additional clarification needed in relation to the plan for graduate students, especially in regards to the “instructor of record” issue. He asked what the plans were in relation to the GA budgets.

**Chancellor Montemagno** responded that the GA budgets were already handed down to the Deans and the Department heads. He said his position on graduate students serving as “instructor of record” is quite clear. Graduate students will not serve as “instructors of record.” They can be mentored, can be in the classroom, can give lectures, but there will be a supervising faculty member responsible for the content of the course, the selection of texts, and the assurance of overall quality. Being in the classroom is an important part of the process for educating graduate students. At the same time, it is not reasonable for a graduate student with no prior training to be put in place as “instructor of record” and teach undergraduates, he said. It doesn’t do the graduate students any service, having nobody there to give them feedback and guidance that will help them grow as instructors. It doesn’t do the undergraduates any service either, who come to a university expecting to be taught by professors. It is not common practice anywhere that he has seen, and it is contrary to insuring the best experience for our undergraduates and graduates alike.

**C Awsumb** asked if the Chancellor could clarify the difference between the supervised teaching he was talking about and what T.A.s that are “instructor of record” are currently doing at the University.

**Chancellor Montemagno** responded that there is a significant difference. An “instructor of record” has the ability to decide the course syllabus, the texts being used, the grades being assigned, and who can take the course. In teaching or lecturing under supervision, the syllabus has been determined, the textbook has been chosen and the student cohort has been selected by the faculty. There might be some confusion that “instructor of record” means being able to lecture. Clearing up this confusion is the challenge.

**C Awsumb** then asked about whether T.A.s would serve solely in an assistant capacity, even those that facilitate discussion and group work in larger lectures.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that there are students who manage recitation sessions, for example, who would still do that; it’s not prohibited. He said he simply doesn’t want them to be “instructors of record.” In fact, there are only about 40 “instructors of record” on campus as of last year, a small number. The activities that C Awsumb outlined are well within the training purview for students.

**W Calvert** clarified that he understood the question was whether anything else was in the training purview of mentored teaching.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said yes, that students can work in concert with professors to prepare classes, design experiments, but students do not have ultimate responsibility for course content and quality.

**C Awsumb** asked whether we knew to what extent students that currently serve as “instructor of record,” who are choosing textbooks, assigning grades, writing syllabi, are already getting feedback and guidance as part of their overall training.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said if they were they wouldn't be "instructor of record." He clarified that some students may currently be mislabeled as "instructors of record," which should be corrected.

**C Awsumb** added that if you are a student leading a discussion, most of the time you are picking up at the end of the week, grading papers, writing reviews of things covered in the main section. Some T.A.s lead experiments, a completely different responsibility. There is a huge gap between assisting on the instruction and going through and thinking how to design a course, how to merge a textbook with that course, how to write a lecture. This notion of supervised teaching's being between full responsibility and only assisting is problematic when nowhere does a student as "instructor of record" create and implement courses without some context and some guidance.

**Chancellor Montemagno** responded that if a student is labeled as "instructor of record," then the ultimate responsibility lies with him. That responsibility of quality, content, and textbook selection will no longer be shifted to the graduate student; it will remain with the faculty member.

**L Schaefer** clarified that the Chancellor was suggesting that SIU hire NTTs in those "instructor of record" positions. She understands that NTT can sometimes have only a master's degree and said she would like to know why an NTT is considered more qualified here than a graduate student who is receiving their PhD. She said that students find it insulting when the Chancellor says that those students do not know the difference between being a GA and an "instructor of record" or that they do not have the experience necessary. She offered a personal example of her being an "instructor of record" for a large debate class on this campus. With her decade of experience, she said, to suggest that someone else in her department has more experience in teaching debate than she does is also insulting. She added that the Chancellor pointed to research and labs, which the humanities do not have. She asked then why people in the humanities were not qualified to do this work when they have M.A.s. Also she asked how it was possible to go to an institution for a tenure track position without having written a syllabus and never selected a textbook.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that the responsibility of a graduate student is to be trained and educated towards becoming a professor. This, in his opinion, requires supervision in GA activities. He said not to believe for a moment that one can't get hired without having been labeled "instructor of record." He said common hiring practice is asking about experience teaching in which a student worked with a faculty member to prepare a syllabus or select a textbook.

**L Schaefer** first asked the Chancellor to treat her with the same respect he showed her male counterparts. She then pointed out that students at other schools are allowed to be "instructors of record." Her alma mater is an example of one. She added that she was on a hiring committee for a tenure position there; they chose someone because he/she had "instructor of record" experience. She continued that other universities in her discipline allow "instructors of record," saying that if the Chancellor takes this away, she cannot get a job, especially at a teaching institution. She asked how one goes to a teaching institution, requesting to teach, having had no experience as "instructor of record."

**Chancellor Montemagno** said he thinks that students will get the experience they need to become a professor even if they are not categorized as "instructor of record."

**T Haniotakis** wished to clarify that NTTs can sometimes have 10 to 20 years of experience, which students don't have. He added that developing a course, finalizing course notes on a new course, determining what students do and do not understand, can take him 2 to 3 years to figure out. PhDs do

not have that time. He also said that student opinion must be taken into account. He has seen students doing what was described and has done exit interviews for students who may not want other students teaching them. In other words, having a professor or an NTT teach courses is a boost for the university. In response to L Schaefer, who suggested without this experience in her PhD she wouldn't get a job, he said during their PhD, students are not ready and there is a difference between starting a PhD and someone ready to graduate.

**J Flowers** clarified that the concern is that GAs as "instructors of record" are unsupervised in relation to the elements we have discussed and the FAQ sheet on the Chancellor's website.

**Chancellor Montemagno** answered that that was correct.

**J Flowers** said that to his knowledge, no "instructor of record" on campus was unsupervised. He gave his own experience as an example of supervised "instructor of record" status. He then asked the Chancellor what evidence he could provide that GAs on this campus are unsupervised. In response to T Haniotakis specifically, J Flowers mentioned that before he was allowed to teach at SIUC, he had to go through a teaching practicum designed and directed by faculty. In his estimation the Chancellor's plan would essentially reduce all teaching to the content of his practicum.

**T Haniotakis** responded that with an MA, one can become an NTT at a university, but that doesn't mean that one cannot become a PhD student. The Chancellor wants people with experience and the title to take the responsibility. It is a matter of organization and of record.

**J Lynn Smith** asked that the council remember the differences in disciplines.

**K Jones** offered an example from her department in which "instructors of record" teach who do not have the expertise in necessary disciplines and do not have the supervision that the Chancellor is suggesting. She said she would appreciate an NTT in those areas that were able to come in and teach those courses because she is now pulling graduate students from different disciplines to teach them. Secondly, departments are undergoing self-studies currently with very specific student learning outcomes being developed by faculty. They are determining how courses incorporate into the total curriculum for those degrees. It takes a year or two to come to know the students and how to effectively deliver a curriculum to them. She reiterated that SIUC wants what is best for students, and in the grand picture, it is important that we have some permanency in courses.

**L Schaefer** said she thought the issue was with the broad sweep of all "instructors of record." She then suggested that the Chancellor could do a little more work on his vision and go to each department to ask if they prefer "instructors of record" or NTTs.

**J Shapiro** asked what doing away with "instructors of record" would mean for the English department, which administers some 40 sections of English 101 each semester. In these 40 sections, English students are "instructors of record," but the course is designed by faculty, the textbooks chosen by faculty, etc. He added that in ENGL 101, there is no direct contact, however, between a faculty member with a PhD and the students in the courses. He then asked that if he became "instructor of record" with graduate students under his supervision, would he then be responsible for grading papers for 40 sections.

**Chancellor Montemagno** answered that J Shapiro would supervise the graduate students as a senior course coordinator responsible for managing course content. He might also sit in during courses, listen to student criticism, and provide feedback, while maintaining personal responsibility for content, quality, and outcomes of the course. Being the "instructor of record" is a very specific authority within

the university, he added. In his opinion, it does not sound as if English students are in fact functioning as “instructors of record,” as they didn’t select textbooks or make syllabi.

**J Shapiro** responded that faculty are not currently in those classrooms; they are small seminar style courses in which graduate students are delivering the content, reading and grading papers, etc. He said he thought it would be screwy if he had his name attached to the course without having direct contact with the students therein.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said it is an issue of responsibility and delegation of authority. It comes down to who has ultimate responsibility for the course and the quality of the content.

**D DiLalla** added that his office has already began to reach out to colleges to manage the kind of transition being discussed. He considers this discussion to be largely semantic. He said a lot of people are currently listed as “instructor of record” who should not be listed so. What will be happening on the ground should not shift a lot, and his office is closely working with colleges and deans to figure this out.

**T Haniotakis** said he thinks what we are talking about with “instructor of record” is that someone is checking to see that GAs are grading similarly across sections. Someone oversees that things work.

**T Clark** said that human ability varies and teaching is a developmental craft. He sees this as a gentle precautionary and fiduciary responsibility. The people who guided him, he said, did it in a gentle and nurturing way, and when they deemed it the right time, they let him go and helped him when he failed.

**R Whaley** said that she appreciated that there is some flexibility in approaching different departments and that she hopes that a discussion can be had between the Chancellor and the Sociology Department. She did caveat that the Department does believe people get jobs because of their experience teaching. She then asked what the place of graduate directors was in this new organization, if there even would be graduate directors.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said yes there would be.

**YT Lee** then offered a few comments. He said our motivation is constructive and that 1) training and quality is very important. The Chancellor, students, and faculty care about quality. Whatever we do, we have to think about quality for undergraduates and graduates; 2) every discipline is different, so we have different opinions but need to respect others’ disciplines; 3) finally he suggested that the Graduate Council Policy Committee explore institutional policy on this matter.

#### **Remarks—Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost David DiLalla**

**Co-Provost David DiLalla** said that his office had communicated earlier in the week the FY19 budget information to colleges. No budget has been received from the State but the University is hopeful that it will receive one soon. His office communicated to the deans that they can anticipate GA budgets at the same level as the FY18 budget, with the recognition that there is the possibility of some modest adjustments associated with changes, for example, in the way “instructor of record” status is managed. Additionally, deans have been given the discretion to not commit 100% of their budgets immediately. Deans have the authority to make determinations about when they will commit funds; they can proceed, though, with commitments that allow international admissions to be extended for January and the fall and can begin the process of graduate admissions for domestic students in the fall as well. Deans have that information, and departments should be directed to proceed with admissions and offers of graduate support for the fall of 2018. Funding for those GA positions will be as it has been, a mixture of state funding, grant funding and, in some cases, local funding and distance education funding. He said he anticipates no changes from past practices.

**L Schaefer** asked that though the amount of money that graduate students can receive has not changed, will deans have the discretion to do whatever they want with that budget, and will they be made to give the money allocated to graduate students to graduate students.

**D DiLalla** responded that the graduate budget is for graduate students. The question is at what time deans want to commit funds. For example, he said, let's assume the state decides they are going to give us a 10% budget cut; we need to ask how we will respond. Deans may decide that they want to hold back 5% of their budget to make strategic investments in GAs in the future. It has to rest with academic deans to make that decision. Deans will not, however, get to spend that budget in any way they feel.

**L Schaefer** then asked about the plan to cut back on graduate assistantships and move to grant funded assistantships instead.

**D DiLalla** said that there was no such plan and that he did not know where that rumor came from; it is not true. He asked Johnathan if he could comment on where it came from.

**J Flowers** asked if D DiLalla was certain he would like to know the source of that information.

**D DiLalla** told J Flowers to feel free to divulge that information.

**J Flowers** said the information was initially received at a meeting of the four union presidents and was reiterated by Matt Baughman some two weeks after that meeting. It was again modified by M Baughman a week later. He said that he then reached out to individuals from the Graduate School, who he claims said that M Baughman gave them a verbal directive that was later rescinded on October 25<sup>th</sup> subsequent to the update of the Chancellor's FAQ website. J Flowers said he went to confirm it with M Baughman who said that no such directive had been given. J Flowers said that either M Baughman's statement was false or the two individuals in the Graduate School lied to him. M Baughman referred him to the FAQ website, which had then been updated. J Flowers told D DiLalla that if he wished to dispute those facts, he might speak with the four union presidents and then speak to M Baughman.

**D DiLalla** said that J Flowers had misunderstood the information given him. Bauman was talking about a query into whether GA contracts could be written for international students entering in January. Departments wanted to write contracts for a full year period, but at that point in time, because an FY19 GA budget had not yet been communicated, the Provost's office directed departments not to write international GA contracts unless they had grant funded support for them. He added that it protects SIU's interests with the information it had in hand at the time with respect to the FY19 GA budget. He clarified that for that limited group of international GAs, at that moment, we were not committing state funds. He said as always, at this time of year, budgets are communicated to colleges. They could expect roughly the same budget as last year. D DiLalla reiterated that J Flowers misunderstood the directive which has always been to not commit to GA contracts before a budget is communicated, unless there is proof of funding. He apologized if there was a misunderstanding but indicated that J Flowers had disseminated incorrect information as the result of a miscommunication.

**J Flowers** said that he was forwarding what was communicated to him from M Baughman and individuals at the Graduate School responsible for this process.

**D DiLalla** restated that J Flowers had misunderstood what he was told. He then invited J Flowers to talk to him if there were any questions in the future.

**J Flowers** clarified that D DiLalla was saying that the fault rested with J Flowers in the misunderstanding.

**D DiLalla** said that no one was at fault, but that if there were questions or concerns, J Flowers could talk to him. He added that it has never been said that SIU would limit GA funding to grant funded dollars.

**L Schaefer** responded that she still thought that graduate students had questions about how funding would be allocated after restructuring. She asked if we could expect cuts or expect that we will not receive the assistantships that we were under the assumption we would receive.

**D DiLalla** said that we have taken a stronger position than we did a year ago and that we told deans a year ago to expect receiving 75% of the prior budget. He anticipates the same budget in FY19 that was in FY18. He did acknowledge that some adjustments would be made but that they would be modest. He could not give numbers yet, but he thinks that for most GAs, it will be status quo in the next year.

**L Schaefer** said that D DiLalla might have told people what they were getting, but that was before we knew we were getting a massive restructuring. She added that given the Chancellor's apparent unwillingness to meet with graduate students, she still had many questions. She said that for the most part students can't afford to wait to figure out whether they will get paid next year. She reiterated that this Council was the only chance that graduate students had to ask questions. She said she needs to report to graduate students whether they should think about transferring because of anticipated budget cuts. This is a conversation being had, she said, because we do not get our questions answered.

**D DiLalla** responded that graduate programs were moving with each other in the restructuring; programs will not be removed, except for the small number identified in the sustainability plan. Programs are going to remain.

**L Schaefer** asked if he could comment on where programs would reside.

**D DiLalla** answered that graduate programs are going to stay with the undergraduate programs. Programs with BAs, masters, and doctorates will move together and stay together as one would expect them to in their home departments.

**L Schaefer** asked then if funding is pooled whether each program was going to have to barter for funds.

**D DiLalla** said that as he said at the last meeting, leaders of the schools are going to do what they need to do to make appropriate allocations. He said he imagines this will be similar to what happens now; an area coordinator indicates to a chair their needs. In the new structure, those coordinators will communicate to a school director, proceeding much in the way it does now.

**L Schaefer** asked whether school directors then decide on their own how to allocate money to graduate students. She asked if anyone was communicating with the program directors.

**D DiLalla** said yes that this is the responsibility of the school director to decide. This is already happening in complex departments.

**N Carver** clarified that deans allocate money to departments and that it would work the way it works already. It is not like the chair gets to decide how much money she wants, he added.

**L Schaefer** said that she has seen a similar restructuring and that what she is describing happened. She then asked if funding will be voted on.

**D DiLalla** said we do not allocate funding based on a voting system.

**L Schaefer** then asked who will advocate for departments and the allocation of funds.

**C Awsumb** asked if we should expect for next year the same overall budget for GAs as this year.

**D DiLalla** said that was correct, with the understanding that we do not have a FY19 budget yet.

**C Awsumb** asked, in that there will be fewer colleges and different unit structures, how the budget allocation process would be guided, especially in relation to the hiring of NTTs in departments or units that might not look the same next year.

**D DiLalla** answered that we will work in the structure we have. Deans and chairs will guide the GA appointment process and the NTT hiring process. Hiring or GA appointments will be linked to academic programs; if they move, the money will move. We have to plan hiring and GA appointments now, he said. Written contracts will then be enforced and the budget will be modified accordingly.

**J Shapiro** commented that in the current chain of command, chairs serve at the pleasure of their respective deans and are also voted on by members of their departments. He wondered if in the new structure the director of a school would be the equivalent of the old chair of a department and, if so, would the faculty members in a school be voting on those directors.

**D DiLalla** responded that any hiring goes through a process in relation to department operating papers and University hiring policy. He said they try to dovetail these but that University policy trumps operating papers. We will hire using University policy procedures for directors but, with respect to selection procedures at the school level, this would be an operating papers issue for the new school.

**J Maddox** commented that the Law School only has RAs and TAs and that this past fall funding for those positions was taken away from students. She asked if there was a chance that funding will be replaced.

**D DiLalla** said he was not familiar with that issue, but would be happy to dialogue with her about it. He added that a GA budget is not typically given to the Law School in the way it is for the rest of campus.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that that may change as the Law School GA budget has been moved back to the University.

#### **Remarks—Interim Vice-Chancellor for Research Jim Garvey**

**J Garvey** remarked that people continue to write grants and contracts and that OSPA remains extremely busy. He said his office does try to enforce giving them at least a three days-notice before trying to get a grant in. They recently had an investigator try to submit a grant on the day that it was due, which was not possible. He reminded everyone to plan ahead. He then asked for questions regarding research.

#### **Remarks—Graduate School Dean Yueh-Ting Lee**

**Dean Lee** indicated that he had several areas to report on. First, he mentioned that recruitment season would be coming to an end in mid-November and that the Graduate School staff had attended 15 to 19 different graduate fairs around the Midwest. It is good publicity for SIUC to reach out to prospective students on other campuses, he said, though it is not clear yet how many students will apply to SIUC. He added that on November 15<sup>th</sup> at 3PM the Graduate School would be having an internal recruitment event in the Morris Library. Approximately ten graduate programs are scheduled for exhibits, and there will be a questions and answer panel session. Dean Lee hopes that hundreds of SIUC undergraduates will show up to the event and consider applying to the SIUC Graduate School. Second, he said that on October 12<sup>th</sup>, our Graduate School had its annual ceremony to recognize 50 graduate students who received fellowships in 2017-2018. Dr. Lizette Chevalier and Dr. Jim Garvey were invited to speak to those fellows. Additionally he reminded us that on November 8<sup>th</sup> at 3PM in the Student Services Building room 150-160, there would be an informal workshop to the graduate students and graduate faculty members on how to apply for 2018-2019's fellowship programs. Third, Dean Lee reported that on October 16<sup>th</sup>, the Illinois Association of Graduate School Deans had a meeting at Illinois State University



in Normal. The convening body discussed international student recruitment and retention and stressed mental health issues for graduate students. Several provosts were in attendance; they shared their experience with graduate education quality and support. The meeting was good overall. Dean Lee concluded by announcing some deadlines. November 3<sup>rd</sup> is the deadline for format checks for thesis and dissertations, and November 10<sup>th</sup> is the official submission deadline for all theses and dissertations.

**J Flowers** said that the Chancellor's FAQ on reorganization indicated that some units would be moved out of the Graduate School and into their appropriate schools. He then asked if the Chancellor had communicated to Dean Lee which units would be moved.

**L Chevalier** answered that these were two degree programs, one being ERP and the other being the Professional Sciences Master's; they will go to academic homes.

#### **Remarks—Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Lizette Chevalier**

**L Chevalier** reported that the University is in the process of doing program reviews. Dr. Rimmer did ask her about the Graduate Council representatives on the program review committees. L Chevalier said she would get back to S Rimmer on that. Dean Laurie Bell is helping to run the program reviews until July 1<sup>st</sup>, and if anyone is contacted by her, it will be about reviews. L Chevalier added that SIUC is in the process of centralizing advisement as well, and a task force is in place to help with various elements of the process. It is going well, and two extremely productive meetings have been held. L Chevalier's office has also digitized the undergraduate catalogue and is in the process of starting the next catalogue. The graduate catalogue, she said, is going to take about a year. She anticipates that this time next year, the graduate catalogue will be digitized.

#### **Report—Council's Chair, Tomás Velasco**

No report

#### **Action Items:**

#### **Second Reading: Resolution in Support of Master's Degree Changes in Psychology**

**N Carver** asked why it was "23 to 24" additional hours and not simply "at least 23 hours".

**W Calvert** responded that he believed they had an option for requirements; one of them was so many hours and the other was so many hours plus 1.

**N Carver** said it seems like saying "a minimum of 23 hours" makes more sense.

**W Calvert** said that if N Carver would like to propose an amendment to clean up the wording, he would support it.

**N Carver** proposed an amendment to the language that says students have to take "a minimum of 23 hours after completing the bachelor's degree."

The Members voted on the motion for amendment: Yes-24, No-0, and Abstain-1. The motion carried.

The Members voted on the resolution: Yes-24, No-0, and Abstain-0. The resolution was passed.

**Second Reading: Resolution in Support of the Online M.B.A. Concentration in Analytics**

**K Jones** asked if the program had the \$10,000 it needed to start.

**M Peterson** said yes.

The Members voted on the resolution: Yes-21, No-0, and Abstain-1. The resolution was passed.

**Second Reading: Resolution in Support of the Policy Allowing for the Exemption of the TOEFL Requirement**

**T Shaw** asked what “continuous” meant in this context.

**S Babbitt** replied that it meant continuously living in the United States and not leaving for vacations, etc.

**T Shaw** asked about a time frame of how long one could remain outside of the U.S.

**S Babbitt** said that outside of the U.S. for a year or more was considered not continuous.

**T Shaw** clarified then that anything less than a year is considered continuous.

**M Brown** asked why the TOEFL score was specified in the resolution.

**S Babbitt** said that it was specified because if students take a TOEFL exam for another university’s bachelor’s degree and meet SIUC requirements, then we can accept them even with expired scores.

**M Brown** asked if giving a specific number meant anything or if just having the number was important.

**S Babbitt** said the score was the minimum score requirement for graduate admissions at SIUC.

**M Brown** asked if eliminating that score in this context would effect that requirement.

**S Babbitt** said yes.

**M Brown** then asked if the TOEFL score phrasing was eliminated here, would that carry over to policy change to overall requirements.

**W Calvert** added that it would make an importance difference, because then it would make it sound as if we would accept any score, however low, from somebody meeting these other requirements.

**M Brown** wondered if this was an issue for another first reading.

**N Carver** pointed out that what J Lynn Smith read was not what T Velasco sent out.

**J Lynn Smith** said that there were two TOEFL resolutions today, one for second reading and one for first reading.

**T Velasco** specified which resolution was which.

**M Brown** said that he understood the issue here was about the “immediately prior” language. He asked whether striking this language here has an immediate effect on policy regarding TOEFL. He said he is not sure if the requirement score language should be introduced here.

**T Velasco** asked if M Brown was suggesting a change.

**M Brown** said not striking the number here.

**W Calvert** clarified that M Brown was suggesting no change should be made to the resolution.

**J Lynn Smith** said she met with S Babbitt, who said that this resolution was not as ambitious as the first one. J Lynn Smith said they could either scrap this resolution and start anew or modify it. They decided to do this one in its limited modified scope and do one later that has larger aims.

**M Brown** asked if including “obtain a TOEFL score of 550/80” language does the work of the second resolution.

**S Babbitt** answered no because the second deals specifically with masters degrees, and this deals with any degree not a bachelor’s degree.

The members voted on the resolution: Yes 22, No-0, and Abstain-0. The resolution was passed.

### **Second Reading: Resolution in Support of a Change to Credit-Hour Requirement for Accelerated Master’s Programs**

**N Carver** said that this was not a true change in policy but was clarifying the language in the graduate catalogue.

The Members voted on the resolution: Yes 20, No-0-, and Abstain-0

### **Report—Dean’s Council, Terry Clark**

**T Clark** reported that the Deans had had a couple of meetings since the last Graduate Council meeting. It is fair to say, he said, that the reorganization has dominated discussions, but the Deans continue to be enthusiastic. He added that after the Chancellor put out his strawman, he had people reach out across campus; some said no to the strawman and others were enthusiastic. They also had units reach out that they never thought would reach out. In some cases, the Dean’s Council facilitated meetings first with units and then with faculty if issues required further investigation. The meetings have been positive. He said that moving forward, the Deans will be having meetings with faculty to see how the colleges like the changes. The Deans will then give the Chancellor feedback personally and from the colleges.

### **Report—Faculty Senate, Grant Miller**

**G Miller** said that the Senate had their meeting, during which there was a helpful report from Dr. Lewin about campus climate data in regards to diversity. During the meeting they passed a resolution on campus diversity and a resolution that specifically related to the development of African Studies. They also looked at a resolution to modify final exam schedules. They will have a special meeting with the Chancellor to talk about Executive Council and to dialogue about restructuring and other related issues.

**K Stickers** asked if there were any consensus on the status of Africana Studies.

**G Miller** responded that they released a statement in general support of the program in the hopes that it will be a large part of the dialogue going forward.

**Report—Council Vice Chair, Julie Partridge**

**J Partridge** said that she did not have any requests for committees. She added that her office had one grievance that was closed in the past week. She thanked those on the committee that helped with it.

**Reports from Standing Committees:**

**New Programs Committee Report: Wesley Calvert**

First reading of the “Resolution in Support of Ph.D. Changes in Geology”

**S Esling** commented that the Ph.D. is technically called Geosciences.

**T Velasco** said that this will be changed in the resolution.

**J Flowers** clarified that this RME eliminates 4 concentration options in the Geosciences Ph.D. in the Geology Department.

**N Carver** added that currently people have to choose one of those concentrations.

**S Esling** said that that both were correct.

**Educational Policies Committee Report: Jennifer Lynn Smith**

First reading of the “Resolution in support of waiving the TOEFL Requirement for Applicants holding a Master’s Degree from an Accredited Institution in the United States.”

**M Brown** asked why we have a TOEFL requirement.

**S Babbitt** indicated that students are required to meet proficiency. The University has a requirement for everyone; departments can request higher score requirements. Students must just demonstrate that they can read and write at the university level, so as to make sure they are not lost in the classroom.

**M Brown** then asked why the current TOEFL policy was not effective.

**S Babbitt** answered that the current trend, when we go to conferences and fairs, is that universities are waving TOEFL requirements for students who received master’s degrees in the United States. SIUC needs to stay competitive for those students wishing to get a second master’s or a PhD here.

**M Brown** asked if SIUC had many students that are provisionally admitted with low scores, and if so how many.

**S Babbitt** said approximately 10-15 students per semester

**M Brown** asked if waiving this would affect SESL.

**S Babbitt** said it would only be for those coming in for a second masters or PhD, but not for original degrees.

**N Carver** said that in his experience students who already have degrees from institutions in the U.S. are told that their scores are out of date and that they will have to retake the TOEFL. They don't retake and don't come to SIUC. He added this will not affect SESL, but leaves things to the departments to decide.

**T Haniotakis** asked if anyone knew what score requirements were at other universities. He said we should consider students who miss the TOEFL score but score highly in other requirement areas.

**S Babbitt** answered that most universities require 550, which is either an 80 or 79; we interpret it as 80.

**N Carver** added that departments can request exceptions for 79.

#### **Research Committee Report: Sajal Lahiri**

**S Lahiri** said that the committee has looked at the proposed IP agreement sent from the Office of Technology Transfer. It was suggested that there should be an SIU system-wide agreement, which all visiting scholars, staying more than a month, would be asked to sign. Concerns and feedback have been more or less addressed in the document presented to the Council. S Lahiri reiterated that this is a system-wide agreement and that many parties are involved. The final document has to go to the Legal Department for approval. He said they would like some feedback from the Council members.

**T Velasco** commented that the Council could pass a resolution independently.

**N Carver** asked if S Lahiri could summarize the concerns that his committee had.

**S Lahiri** responded that they wanted clarity on different types of visiting scholars. They also wanted clarity on procedure for disputes between parent institutions and SIU. Our policy is guided by the Board of Trustees and is available online, he said. Now, institutions work out disputes between themselves.

**J Garvey** recommended that the SIUC campus should have its own policy that we govern ourselves. He added that at the system level, we can be flexible. He reiterated that we should not take into account what SIUE wants, but think about what is best for our campus.

**S Lahiri** asked how an SIUC only policy would work and whether the Board of Trustees approves it.

**T Velasco** said that we can create policy, and it is up to the Administration to accept or deny it.

**J Garvey** said that he and the research administrators from the other two campuses have a conversation with OTT. They can work together later to come up with what we want from a system-wide perspective.

**S Lahiri** asked whether the Technology Transfer was an SIU system-wide policy.

**J Garvey** said it was complicated. For example, the way IP is negotiated is part of the faculty contract; our contract has a different set of stipulations than SIUE would have with their union, and ours will take

precedent for our faculty. What this group does will inform contract negotiations in the future. So you want to get ahead of it and do what is best for SIUC first.

**Chancellor Montemagno** was concerned with the hamper the agreement puts on meaningful collaborations between SIUC and other institutions. The idea that the lab notebooks of a visiting faculty member are owned by SIU and have to be surrendered to SIU is not productive, he argued. He pointed out challenges in the agreement to SIUC's desire to engage on the world stage and to bring in researchers to its laboratories and community. Currently, if a researcher is here for a summer, we impose that everything they do is owned by SIUC. This is a problem he thinks requires more dialogue before a vote is taken on the agreement.

**S Lahiri** said he had a similar concern and that the language was starker in the previous draft.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that what is going to happen is someone who comes to SIU is going to send this document to their home institution before signing it. It could take months for the two institutions to agree on the document before the visitor arrives. These mechanics negatively impact our ability to communicate and partner with institutions. He said we should spend time figuring out what we are trying to protect and preserve and what we think is now in the agreement that really isn't.

**M Chitambar** thinks that the core issue that they are trying to address is the kind of equity between what our faculty is doing and what visiting faculty is doing. With the policy in place, it is not currently clear what happens. If SIU doesn't own intellectual property that is developed here, which is in collaboration with an SIU faculty, our faculty gets what is in SIUC's IP policy, and the visiting faculty might own half of the invention and would enjoy any revenue that came from it. This could be greater than what our faculty gets.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that if a faculty member comes here and engages in the development of an invention, both of them are listed as co-inventors. There might be disparity between IP regulations of home institutions and SIUC's IP policy.

**M Chitambar** responded that it depends on the policy. There is a huge variety of IP policies at different institutions.

**J Garvey** suggested looking at other institutions and their best practices.

**N Carver** added that Section 3, which the Chancellor mentioned, was unbelievable. It says a visitor cannot take any files with them that they created at SIUC. He said no one will agree with this.

**M Chitambar** asked whether SIU's retaining copies of those files would be satisfactory.

**N Carver** said that that was completely different. Now it says SIU owns the files and that they have to be surrendered.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that this was inconsistent with SIU's being an R1 research institution.

**T Velasco** said we can definitely write a resolution to engage with how the agreement is written.

**D McDowell** asked if this were something that the research committee could work with the Law School on. They have plenty of IP Law students.

**S Lahiri** said that Sheena Hart was currently on the committee.

**M Chitambar** added that they are working with a patent attorney and that she herself had a legal background.

**N Carver** pointed out that in the very first paragraph, it lists the various units of SIU collectively and then says that it is specifically defined as the SIU campus. He said he has no idea what campus is being talked about in the document. The document is ambiguous and has many problems.

**T Velasco** asked if M Chitambar could rewrite the IP agreement and submit it to the council so that the research committee might write a resolution on the new agreement.

**S Lahiri** said that SIUC's having its own policy was a different issue. He asked how one goes about that.

**J Garvey** said that if we want to change our policy on this campus, we can. That policy is on the website. We go back to the OTT group and say we need to modify the policy. Then we take it to the Board to be agreed upon. However, if SIUE is going one direction and we are going another, then that is fine, as both have different ideas about how to do research.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that in his experience, he would send a student to another institution. That student would then come back to do more experiments, going back and forth during the process. Now if that student spends 30 days or more in a 12 month period at SIUC, we capture the research. The Chancellor said he thinks we need to determine who we are and what the purpose is in trying to create a unified policy. His ambition is to reduce the barriers to collaboration with other institutions, not to make collaboration more onerous.

**J Garvey** said it becomes even more complicated when we have researchers who come on our campus to use our facilities but who aren't truly collaborating; it becomes fuzzy. We should discuss what occurs when a researcher uses SIUC facilities to develop research and what SIUC does and doesn't own.

**T Clark** asked whether this agreement covered only intellectual production that has a pecuniary dimension, or if this included the work of a guest novelist or poet.

**Chancellor Montemagno** said that if when co-writing a paper or book, someone spends a week here and our researcher spends a week there, then the process becomes confused.

**M Chitambar** said that this agreement is about what is and is not covered in the IP policy. Our IP policy has exceptions for most copyrighted things, from software programs to poetry and course materials.

**T Haniotakis** clarified that we cannot, for example, tell a researcher that we own the measurements on research that has some previous claim.

**S Rimmer** said that this may be addressed in the exceptions, but it seems to her that many start a collaboration not knowing if it is going to lead to a development that could be worthy. She asked whether this agreement then would be something that every collaborator has to sign just in case.

**S Lahiri** added that he has visited many universities, sometimes for months at a time, and had never been asked to sign anything like this.

#### **Program Review Committee Report: Sue Rimmer**

**S Rimmer** said they completed and sent recommendations for program review committee members to the Associate Provost's Office. She asked what, in the past when the graduate council has recommended a faculty member to serve on a review committee, the status of that person was. She asked if they were put on the committee as an internal member or if they were given as a potential for the department to select.

**T Velasco** said that generally it is the Council's prerogative to select who is going to be on the committee. We choose the person as our representative.

**S Rimmer** asked, if they are going to be included in a department that was going to have two internal reviewers on the committee, would they then be our recommendation.

**L Chevalier** clarified that in, for example, Geology, if we say that reviewer is for Geology, then they are. They are the specific person for that program.

**T Velasco** said that typically it is our representative for that process of internal review.

**S Rimmer** asked whether they would be given a specific representative and not a pool to choose from. She added that in the case of Geology and other programs, she believes in the last week that they were given a list of reviewers who were approved, and chairs were asked to set up their review committees. She said that at least some programs will have made those selections already, not knowing that the Graduate Council's recommendation was to be included. She asked if we would retroactively fix that.

**L Chevalier** said she did not think that the process had gone forward to the point that we cannot put the appropriate person where they are assigned. There has to be some flexibility, and we will work according to S Rimmer's intent, she said.

#### **Report from GPSC: Clay Awsumb**

**C Awsumb** reported that GPSC passed a resolution within their body to allocate a greater portion of activity fees to GPSC organizations. He said they will use these funds for RSOs and graduate professional support. The Undergraduate Council also took up a similar resolution, which will be coordinated with the Graduate resolution. The general committee has continued to work on graduate surveys, on issues of mental health, and on fostering mentorship. J Flowers has also been nominated as co-chair of the University's Diversity Council.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00AM