

Graduate Council 2022-2023

March 2, 2023

Members present: Jeremy Allen, Heidi Bacon, Lisa Brooten, Jason Dallas, Craig Gingrich-Philbrook, Matthew McCarroll, Tomas Velasco, Andy Wilber, Zvi Rosen, Kyle Plunkett, Rachel Nozicka, Eric Brevik, Buffy Ellsworth, Usha Lakshmanan, Myla Burton, Robert Morgan, Bethany Rader, Liliana Lefticariu, Philip Chu, John Pollitz, Nwamaka Anaza, Chris Wienke

Executive-Officio: Costas Tsatsoulis, Karen Jones, Andrew Youpa

Guests: Ryan Netzley, Julie Lindsey, Daniel Beevers.

Meeting started at 8:00 AM

Consideration of the minutes of the previous meeting

Gingrich-Philbrook: Were there any corrections to the minutes that people wanted to make?

Gingrich-Philbrook: Hearing none. Let us go ahead If you are willing to approve the minutes. Please write Yes, minutes in the chat for Francis when he gets the vote, and then, of course, No or abstain, if that is your vote.

Minutes approved (24-0-0)

Remarks from the Chancellor: Austin Lane

Gingrich-Philbrook: The Chancellor is unable to join us today because he is on a recruiting mission. Let us go ahead and begin with our remarks from the co-provost.

Remarks from Co-Provost: Robert Morgan

Morgan: Good morning, everybody just by way of a brief report, we are in our prime yield season, so we are working hard at yielding students that have applied but of course, we are still recruiting, that is a nonstop business, but we are more focused on yielding at this point. So, we will start tracking where we are at by way of admissions and things of that nature here, in the next few weeks.

A couple of updates just on the academic side of things, we are looking at improving and increasing our utilization of degree works to afford students a more seamless process in registration process, allow academic advisors to engage a bit more in-depth with students, reduce their workload to some degree so that they can be more focused on actual advising as opposed to scheduling, which is a large part of what advisors do now. So, we are working on some policy and procedural changes, and I will share more about them as they get developed.

We are also looking at and taking a critical review of our policy regarding students that are struggling academically in particular, our probation suspension policies. We have a strict policy when you compare our policies to peer or aspirin institutions, just to give a couple of examples, Texas Tech, Oklahoma State, and Kansas State. We put demands on our students that other schools are not implementing quite as strictly, a little and so we are taking a critical look at that. Those are two things that are in work nothing by way of outcomes yet but things that we are working on to improve situations for our students. Co- act and Provost Mark Morris and I, recognize we are in this role for a brief period and so we are trying to make sure that we engage with things that can and should be changed without putting any things in place that the next provost is going to be stuck with. So that is where we are at my usual preferences to take questions and then try to speak to what I think you would be interested in, so I will stop with that report and open it up for questions for me as the Collecting Provost.

Questions for Co-Provost

Allen: Can you just give me a little insight on what exactly you are talking about in terms of policies that are preventing students on probation? As I understood it, you were saying, we do things that other universities do not do.

Morgan: Our criteria and how we manage the probation processes are a bit strict. For example, if you look at the other three institutions that I named, they have a warning system. So, before students are placed on academic probation, they get alerted that they are at risk for being placed on probation whereas we do not do that, our policy is probation/ suspension and there are a whole lot of things that can occur pre probation, to suspension, to try to ensure that we are reaching out, connecting, and engaging with students in a manner to give them the best opportunity to be successful. So, we are looking at what we want to change within our policy, what the procedure for that would be and we are looking at it at the co-provost level, working with a couple of the other Vice Chancellors on that and then, of course, to go to both the faculty and Student Senate and all the respective organizations that we would need to review it. It will be a shared collaborative decision-making process, but we want to create some additional touch points and flexibility, so students do not go from zero to probation and then to suspension, there are some things we can do in between. So that is what we are trying to do, Jeremy, does that answer your question?

Allen: It does, Thank you.

Morgan: Any other questions?

Gingrich-Philbrook: Let us hear our remarks from the VCR.

Remarks from Vice-Chancellor for Research/Dean of the Graduate School: Costas Tsatsoulis

Tsatsoulis: Good morning, everybody. I have no remarks from the office of the Vice Chancellor of Research, but some remarks that I will make out of my other office, the graduate studies, I will let Karen do so because we have some issues that we would like to discuss with everybody.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Ok, Karen, over to you.

Remarks from Associate Dean & Director of Graduate School: Karen Jones

Jones: Good morning, first, I am going to review what we have been doing this past month. It has been active in graduate school.

At the beginning of the month, we had our 3Mt competition, we had good participation this year, and we did have three (3) winners. Savannah Brandon, who is from the School of Medicine and Pharmacology, did her presentation on modeling stress, induced ADHD for treatment targets, and for those of you who might not be familiar with 3Mt, this is an interesting competition where the students get one slide in three (3) minutes to explain their research project. It is quick and fast-paced, and it is supposed to be delivered to a lay audience, really fascinating, and I encourage you whenever we have this competition next year to nominate your students to come and participate because it is a lot of fun. So, Savannah came in third, and Garrett Williams, who is out of Agricultural science, came in second. His topic was farming for the future conservative crop production practices with an environmental conscience. Our winner was Lakshika Dissanayake Ph.D. in MBMB, and her project is on microbial factories to upgrade plastic. She will be our representative at the regional competition up in Chicago later this month, and she has accepted that role and is preparing to go and represent us quite well.

Our next big event that we had was the graduate student recruitment and retention, action, and planning event. This was an all-day event on February 13th, and we had about ninety (90) participants there, which were composed of upper administration, Deans, and graduate students' participations. We had panels asked good questions, surveys were done, and we even had an opportunity to weigh in on priorities for the university on what directions we should take that is now in the phase of drafting a report to be shared out with the campus community. A draft of that is almost completed, and you should be expecting that soon.

My third event was the week after that where we had a workshop for the directors and coordinators of our graduate studies in February 22nd, which was a several-hour meeting where we updated the units on some policy changes, and we also did a report out of some of the preliminary things from our workshop and that one was video recorded and is available on the graduate school website if anybody is interested in learning what we did during that workshop.

The Fellowship Office has been busy, all the panels have met, and recommendations have been made for the graduate Deans, masters, doctoral, and Morris fellowships. So, all those processes have been completed, and offers have been sent out to the students and we are getting quite a few that are accepting those right now and there is an initial offer list, and there is an alternate list and then we will be spending all those dollars very quickly. Curiously, though, we have a prompt fellowship, PROMPT is an acronym, and it stands for the proactive recruitment of multicultural professionals for tomorrow, we had no applicants for that fellowship offering, and that is a little bit concerning so am thinking that maybe that is not very well known across the campus community, and we would like to get the word out so that next year we at least have some applicants for those dollars, you know finances is always one of the things that comes up as a need with our students, and we do not like to leave money sitting on the table, so we encourage you at least in upcoming competitions, to recommend to your students to apply for the prompt.

The teaching assistantship allocation (TAA) has been made to your deans. So, the formula recommended which we talked a little bit about that last time is all allocated and out there.

The Dissertation research awards are also in the process of being allocated, so if you have students that are in their last semester, Ph.D. students, who are writing their dissertations and are in their last year, there is an award called the DRA and we are going to be giving those allocations out to the colleges as well. Hopefully within the next week to ten days or so.

I think what Costas was alluding to is that we have got Graduate Council elections coming up very quickly and I spoke to Craig a little bit about this recently, and the graduate school needs some help in how to do this process as we are continuing through the reorg and I am going to put that out there. I am not sure whether this will be able to solve any of the

questions during a full graduate council meeting, but we are going to procedurally figure out how to do it if we know who or what representation we need. I will conclude my remarks right there. Thank you.

Questions for Associate Dean & Director

Ellsworth: Karen could you just tell us quickly, what the basic criteria for applying for the prompt are?

Jones: Actually, I would have to look it up myself, but I am sure it is the regular criteria, so it is for new incoming student, unconditionally admitted with an earned degree from an accredited institution of higher learning, a minimum grade point average of 3 on a 4.0 scale, a member of a traditionally under representative group and must be a Us. Citizen.

Ellsworth: Thank you.

Lakshmanan: I had a question about this and I am so glad that you brought this up because for the coming fall, I did have a student who wanted to come to BCS and work with me and she would have qualified but I did check with my department about the prompt and generally for these fellowships, because of the way the deadlines for some programs are on February 1st, and I do not know what the deadline for the prompt is, they do not necessarily always recommend first-year students. I was unaware of the prompt because I did ask, and this student would have qualified at least based on the criteria.

Jones: So, you are suggesting that the timeline needs to be changed?

Lakshmanan: I think in my school there are different programs, and a couple of the programs may have an earlier deadline, but brain and cognitive sciences have a deadline of February 1st, and historically, if at all they do then they have only recommended people for the first incoming students only for the other two programs or so where the deadline was December 1st, but then in this case, there was a student, and I did not know that it is restricted to fresh incoming students.

Jones: The deadline for submitting the prompt is January 20th, so, we are talking about students who are in the fall application and admissions cycle, to get them funding, so we could announce in spring to start in the fall.

Lakshmanan: I did check with my school if she could be nominated, but I was not aware, and I should have looked more closely, I guess; but I did consult with the person, and I did not know that it was for first-year incoming students. So, this student would not qualify next year, right?

Jones: Yes, it should be used; I think as part of a recruitment package.

Lakshmanan: So, which brings me to a point, because we have had like a turnover, and you know people have retired, and then other people who had a history of the place and the procedures, that is one thing, but when new people are dealing with certain procedural issues, I do not know, like new directors or new people working in the graduate admissions office in different schools. Could there be something that could be done so that they are all on par like they know?

Jones: I will say that when we have our workshop in the fall these are announced, so all the directors of the graduate studies are invited, and their assistants are invited to attend. We send out emails to all of them in the fall, and I think the email starts towards the end of November mid to end of November, saying, just a reminder, these fellowships' due dates are early in the spring, we need to be working on them, and so, if there is more that we can do, I am more than happy to listen to suggestions, but we do try to make an effort to reach out to the people who can at least help get that information in front of the students, and you know, to make these things happen. I will say that from what I was told from the Fellowship office is that applications, in general, were lower this year than they have been in past years, and I do think that maybe with the staffing switching over, people are not familiar with the workflow that is coming at them, that maybe some of that messaging was lost, or the planning of it was not ideal. Hopefully, we can do better in the future by educating the members that need to know this information. Also, in addition to this, I have recently been able to communicate directly via email to our students, and the reminder was sent directly to them, too. So, we are trying to communicate better and in multiple streams to try and get the message out.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Karen an interesting thing to think about particularly about the prompt might be that so many members from historically underrepresented groups might also be first generation and my own experience around applying for graduate school, it took a while to be convinced that that was a possibility. So, maybe because of the nature

of the prompt extending the deadline might be something for us to think about for that process to continue to have a little bit more room for people, especially if they are applying for the first time.

Jones: Yes, and just as we are talking about this, I am thinking about my communication tools, because they are for current students and not for the students that have been accepted but it is a different email list. So, I missed them totally, and we should think about a different way of communicating specifically to students for prompts.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you, Karen.

Jones: While we are waiting on whoever is next, I will just say for the recruitment and retention event, we partnered with GPSC to put that event on, and they were wonderful partners, and I want to thank them all very much. Several of our student representatives here were also participants in that event, and I thank them very much.

Gingrich-Philbrook: It was a wonderful event, and thank you Karen for your part, and in putting that on and GPSC, of course. I learned a lot about the university there and I hope we get to do that again. We will go ahead with remarks from Dean Pollitz from the library.

Remarks from Dean of Library Affairs: John Pollitz

Pollitz: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for allowing me to address you. I do not have a whole lot, but I have two things. For a while I have had a question about our compact open access, publishing equity (COPE) funds. These are funds that allow scholars to publish in open-access journals. They pay the page fees, or whatever other kind of fees are needed to publish in these open-access journals, and we want to support that, but because of the paybacks we have had to zero out that line, and unfortunately, I am hoping that once we get our final payback done this year, we can look at that again and move it back into our budget, so that we can help support that kind of publishing. It was not a lot anyway; we had only twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) in there. Well, that was a lot for us, but it does not go far so I apologize. It was suggested that we focused on that for the day of giving and unfortunately, I have got some other priorities that I am going to need to take care of this year and because these are ongoing costs, we need to

get it within our budgets, and I think we will see where we can put it. But the news is that we have not been able to do it for the last four years. Our website says that it is permanently closed, and we would like to open it back up, but we must do this payback for our reserves, and that has taken it up.

On a happier note, I want to bring your attention to the Tenney distinguished lecture for the honors program on Friday, Elizabetta Matsumoto an associate professor from Georgia Institute of Technology is going to talk about her research in geometry, and that includes textiles, 3D printing liquid crystals and more. It is called knotty knits a chat about math and crafts, and it should be interesting. I have known people who taught Math using the Peruvian knotty system in knots and from the Incas. There is a whole lot of math research, and how it creates spaces, and the lecture will be in Guyon Auditorium in the afternoon on Friday and we will be having a reception up in the third-floor rotunda, and that contains a marvelous example of how math can create beautiful spaces and create golden moon spot gyroid that was based on the research that Allen shone did back in the seventies. Allen is a retired emeritus, faculty, member from design and math and he created a formula that allows for the creation of these spaces and planes that are very lightweight, but strong, and turns out beautiful. so, we will have a prime example of how math creates art and science creates art. I think this lecture would be interesting to graduate students as well as students from undergraduate students so please tell your students about this and that is about all I have today.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you. Are there any questions?

Questions for the Dean of Library Affairs

Brooten: I just had a quick question. I am not familiar with this terminology, and I do not understand the process of paybacks, what does that mean?

Pollitz: So, if you remember, I know a lot of people do not know what is going on sometimes on this but during the Budget crisis we were able to make it through without laying off a faculty, or much-classified staff, although we did lay off some classified staff. But we were able to weather that storm in the end by borrowing against our reserves and that has had a great effect on our ability to do things and our bond ready. So, over the

past six years, the Board gave us seven years to pay that back and we have been doing that for six years. The seventh year is next year, and so all the colleges and units across campus will be getting a bill for a portion of that to pay back. The library has been using its overhead, recovery funds, and some general funds because it can not be paid back with State funds, so we have to use local funds and to do that for us, we have not been able to hire any graduate students, and that affects your students as well because we do not have any State funds, OTC funds for graduate students, and so we have not been able to hire graduate students, and we have had to cut back in numerous areas, and the COPE funds have been part of that.

Brooten: Thank you for clarifying that.

Pollitz: For a long time, others were talking about how we borrowed money from Edwardsville, and that just was not the case. It was against our reserves, and you cannot run a university and keep accredited with no reserves.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you, are there any other questions?

Report from Council Chair: Craig Gingrich-Philbrook

Gingrich-Philbrook: From my report I want to just touch base with you about the operating paper revision, as Karen said, we are working to make sure that the formula in the existing operating papers for getting representation in the election, we have to do some adjustment about where people are located relative to their constituencies because of rework, and so tracking a lot of that down has raised a couple of questions that we are in the process of solving. I do want to ask if any of you who might have been on the graduate council before, or who have been here for a while know anything about a membership committee in the graduate Council. There is a reference to it in the operating paper and I have no memory of that ever happening, so I am wondering if there is anyone else who has a memory of that as the committee is also not described in the operating paper. Does anyone have any experience with that?

The last thing that I would say is that I had a wonderful opportunity to spend some time with the different candidates for Provost on several points on their days, and I think

several things were raised by them. Whomever we get, that we might want to put on the sort of the long term agenda, if you will, at the Council and that in particular how we help graduate students identify careers outside the academy, if they are not joining the professor yet, or some initiatives around the country for that, and the arts and humanities that I think, need to tap into. I think all the provost candidates were supportive of working on behalf of graduate students in relationship to fees and salary, so, I think we want to make sure whoever we get, we bring them into our conversations about that as quickly as we can and then last, a number of them were pointed in helping to create programming that used fees that often tended to emphasize undergraduates to make sure that some of that money from those fees was benefiting graduate students, for example, more graduate specific programming and some of the affinity months, in relationship to scholarship and also graduate fees and support, and I think GPSC has been working hard in this regard, and I think we want to support them in making sure that fees that they pay are also benefiting graduate students. I just want to keep that on our table.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Our next report is from Rachel Noszicka from GPSC.

Report from GPSC: Rachel Noszicka

Noszicka: Good morning, GPSC as Dr. Jones mentioned, we were excited to partner with graduate school to host the graduate student recruitment and retention event. Our president, Caleb McKinley Portis, had originally suggested it because he attended a recruitment and retention event for undergraduates and so we were glad to be able to help make an event like that happen for graduate students. We are looking forward to seeing the changes it helps initiate and then to doing anything we can to help with those changes that might take place.

The Council met last night, and we have the privilege of getting out many awards to students for travel and conference, and professional development. So, we would like to ask you to keep encouraging your students to apply for those, the GPSC website was updated, and it is live now, so all those forms are accessible through our website, and I can put the link in the chat.

The Council also gives out a lot of funding for RSOs for events, and our event Funding is running well as we enter the last part of the semester. So, if your student organizations need money to put on events, please encourage them to apply as soon as they can.

As Dr. Jones mentioned, we are entering award season and the Council will be releasing applications to our distinguished and outstanding student service awards, outstanding teaching awards, and student creative activities and research awards. Those applications will be released soon, and then the Council committees will deliberate, and then the awards will be given out at the beginning of May. In addition to that, Caleb and I are both on the Student Council for the SIU system and that Council or that committee has just released the application for the SIU system, distinguished service award which recognizes one undergraduate and one graduate student from both as SIUC and SIU Edwardsville, the medical school, the Dental School, the Law School, and the School of Pharmacy. If it is okay with Dr. Gingrich-Philbrook, I will send you the link to that application, because we have a lot of students at SIU who are doing things that are impactful service-wise to the system as well. So please share that with your units.

The last thing is that we are also entering election season, and we have begun nominations for the elections that will happen in April, so it is important that you and the RSOs attend those meetings to be eligible to vote. So, if you have any RSOs, please make sure they are already attending. We have had good attendance, but please encourage them to come to our meetings and run for an office. Other than that, that is all I have. Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you. Are there any questions for Rachel?

Questions for GPSC: Rachel Noszicka

Brooten: I have a question. Just a clarification. When you mention RSOs, are you referring to graduate RSOs?

Noszicka: Yes.

Brooten: Okay, thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you, Rachel. Our next report comes from the Council Vice-Chair: Tomas.

Report from Council Vice-Chair: Tomas Velasco

Velasco: Good morning. Well, I do not have anything to report today. Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Okay, wonderful, then? Thank you, Tomas. Our next report comes from the Dean's Council Representative Dean Brevik.

Report from Dean's Council: Eric Brevik

Brevik: Good morning, everybody. The big thing from my front today is going back to last summer, I presume, and in the summer previous and the first time that I was here and dealing with it, but we had a situation where we had faculty, who wanted to pay graduate students more than half time, that is a shift over the summer, and they had grant money to do so but we ran into problems where the things we interpreted in terms of Federal guidelines, the policy of the graduate school was that international students could not be paid more than half time. so, we have done some work over the last year here, and I think Karen Jones and Peter Lee, our new CIE Director can clarify those national guidelines and we now have the approval to let international students make more than half-time citizenships over the summer when their faculty advisors have the money to pay them to do so, and the workload that justifies that increase in pay over the summer. So, they still, must register for three credit hours, work to be in good standing, and all the other things to go along with that. It is nice to feel we are making progress somewhere.

Jones: To clarify, it cannot be their first or last semester.

Lakshmanan: I just have a question. So, the restriction that was in place, was that something that was imposed by the University? Or was it an immigration issue?

Jones: The GAU has in the contract that a student that is employed on assistantship in the summer must take three credit hours. Our interpretation has been that if there are three credit hours, then they are students and their visa would say that they are students, and students are limited to a maximum of Fifty Percent (50%) assistantship, so that is how that came about. Dr. Lee, who is our new CIE Director who is also a lawyer said that

he has a different interpretation of that, and now what we understand is that during the summer semester, which is considered a semester off, the students can do whatever they like to do. They can take classes, they can work, and this is my explanation of this, not the lawyer's explanation, but they can do what they want to do in the summer. So now we do not think that we are jeopardizing those international students' visas by allowing them to work that extra time and that is where that came about.

Lakshmanan: Well, that is good.

Tsatsoulis: If I may add, since I was a graduate student, you could enroll as an international student over the summer in research hours and still be working one hundred percent (100%). So, it is an internal rule.

Lakshmanan: Yes, because I remember when I was a graduate student at the University of Michigan, I would work like seventy-five percent (75%), sometimes hundred percent (100%) over the summer.

Jones: So, that is one of the first issues that when I stepped into this interim role, was figuring out the origins of all of this and we have been chipping away at it, waiting for our new director to get here and weigh in, and he has moved quickly on that and so that policy has been updated and remedied as we speak.

Allen: A couple of things Dr. Jones. That is not our contract, right? It is a contract that is negotiated we do not get to make the call. I say us as in GAU, which is a contract that is negotiated between the graduate school and the University, and GAU. Secondly, we are going to be negotiating that contract this year, so if this is something that you want to change in the language of that contract, we should sit down and talk. Anything helpful to students is certainly on the table, which is why we are here. So, if this is a matter of interpretation or changing the rule, that you and I, or whoever else, should sit down and have a conversation about that, the consensus here is that this is not somehow disadvantaging students, international students, and graduate students, and that is something that certainly can be looked at.

Jones: Jeremy, if you will recall, I brought this to your attention last fall. This is something that could be negotiated in the future should we not have gotten clarification at this point. So yes, this is our contract, it is in the GAU contract that requires three credit hours in

summer, for students to be registered for three credit hours to have to hold an assistantship.

Allen: Yes, but the way it was worded it sounded to me like, it was put back on us as if we were somehow damaging our own, and that is not the way it was. Regardless, it does not matter, I understand what you are saying, and yes, you did bring it to my attention, and we should help discuss it further.

Brevik: It is not going back to any one place, but just at a point in time the interpretation that was made, I felt as a dean and others felt as deans of their faculty, this was disadvantageous to the international graduate students, but as Karen said Peter came in and looked at it. I talked to several people about it, like Costas when he came in, I talked to him about it and he is like well, I was an international student and I worked for more than fifty percent (50%) in the summer, but it has been a matter of talking to people throughout time and over this past year, and now, with Peter in place, in CIE he kind of gave that final yes, and he did the breakdown saying here is what the law says, here is how what that means, and wrote a very nice memo back to the graduate school that said, it's okay if our international students are working more than that fifty percent (50%). So really it was not any one point in place or thing that made it difficult, more than just the interpretation SIU has been using, at least in recent years on how far back it goes for that interpretation ended up being laws that the international students not being able to have more than half.

Jones: I just brought up the GAU, because it is contractual in there and these three credit hours are taking which then the interpretation, and we cannot get around that because it is contractual, and that is all I was trying to say.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I am glad that this was sorted out, and it sounds like lots of members were involved with that. So, congratulations! it is good to have this sorted out absolutely. Our next report is from our faculty Senate representative Bethany Raider.

Report from Faculty Senate: Bethany Rader

Rader: Good morning! I just have a short report. Our last setup meeting was February 14th, and in that meeting, we approved the following resolutions.

- i. An NIU for Bs in cyber security.
- ii. An RME for digital narrative and gamification specialization within the BA in English.
- iii. An RME to eliminate the quality management specialization in the Bs in industrial management and applied engineering.
- iv. An RME for specialization in astrophysics.
- v. An RME for a concurrent BA JD program between political science and the school of law and
- vi. A resolution to recommend approval of major GPA 2.0 policy change.

We also, along with the Ad-hoc committee of institutional ranking and educational quality, approved Senate members, Yueh-Ting Lee, and Elaine Jurkowski as Co-chairs of that committee other than that our next meeting will be on March 21st this month, and that is my report. Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you. Well, what I would like to do with the committee reports is to go ahead and jump to Andy to start with the report about the grievance procedure. And if we can I would like you all to think about that as information to the best of our ability, so that we can discuss the AI questions that the committee has for us.

Report from Educational Policies Committee: Andy Wilber

Wilber: Thank you, Craig, we did have a committee meeting, and this was a charge that was placed I believe in the February meeting or maybe even January, but meeting with a group of members who had participated in the grievance process, and there was a memo that was attached along with the minutes, the agenda, that I hope everybody had a chance to review, where I tried to outline the high points of what we learn from this meeting. I think one of the major findings as far as the grievance process is that, as written in the graduate catalog, that process was followed to the best of everyone's ability. We did learn that there was a resolution that was made to change that process or make an amendment to that process that took place in 2021. It does not appear that that resolution, or that language verbiage, was ever included in the current version of the graduate

catalog, so that brought up the question of what is the process by which resolutions are approved, or implemented and Andrew Youpa sent along some information yesterday that pertains to that and that there is a form that needs to be completed, there is a process that must be followed, and I think Dr. Jones has been reviewing any resolution back to 2020 currently. Is that right, Dr. Jones?

Jones: I have a list that I had Francis pull through back to 2021 and honestly, I have not had a chance to go back and double-check everything yet, but that is on my to-do list. It looks like most of the RMEs were implemented, but it is the front-matter stuff that we need to double-check.

Wilber: Thank you for doing that, and one of the other outcomes of this meeting was that we need to delineate or produce an SOP procedure for the grievance process, how that process should proceed, and what the steps are. So, I would be reporting back to the Education Policy Committee and would like to know if anyone is interested in putting that draft SOP together. I will take any questions on the grievance process or that meeting.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Andy, you have access to the policy that we passed, and thought that was going to happen. Right?

Wilber: I do.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Well, I would be happy to help with revising that considering what you all have found. Is there anybody else?

Lakshmanan: I would be happy to do that.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Okay. We will also work with the GPSC representative on the committee for that and then I think if others are interested, it would be okay to have additional representation from GPSC on that, because that was a long effort, and I am glad we know how to fix it. Andrew, thank you for sending us the information that is helpful.

Youpa: Andy the changes that were put into it were implemented in the graduate catalog from November 2021. So, I need to double-check that as well, I am not aware of anything that was not implemented. Regarding the resolution that you are referring to in your memo, I would like to see that because checking our records, we did not find anything

that was not taken care of. So, I am wondering if you have something that we do not have in our files here.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Andrew, I think what we discovered is that, when you sent me those forms, I do not remember being asked to fill out anything like that as chair of the committee last year and so I think what we are talking about is that some of these things probably did not get to you last year.

Youpa: Okay, all right.

Wilber: That is my understanding.

Allen: The proposed changes were included on the website of the graduate school. So, in some places, it looks as if that is the process but then in the catalog, it is not the process that brings me to the question that I have. So, at what point does the policy become official? At what point in the process because there is a recommendation that comes out of committees taken and voted on by graduate counsel, yesterday I read where it outlined what the process was, but at what step does the student have the ability to say, okay, this policy is as of this date.

Youpa: It is when the Chancellor signs the cover letter. So, there is a policy change cover letter that after I receive the resolution, I fill out a form that then goes to the Provost and the Chancellor to get their signatures on it, and at that point, it must be implemented into the catalog but once there are signatures on it, I take it as the beginning of it.

Allen: Thank you.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thanks. Andy, do you want to go ahead with the AI?

Report on the discussion of the use of Open-Source Artificial Intelligence in graduate work

Wilber: The second order of business was related to, reviewing the student code of conduct, looking at the guidelines that currently exist regarding plagiarism as associated with the potential use of these open-source, AI software systems of which new ones are

emerging every day. A Memo was also provided or attached summarizing that discussion as well and I think what we ended up concluding was that it looks like our student code of conduct policy does cover, just the word entity. So, an entity being any source that is used to produce something that is not your own and that would qualify these open-source AI systems. So, based on the current student code of conduct policy, we are potentially covered. The one limitation I believe that we discovered is that the turn-it-in software package that members use for evaluating whether a student's writings are in their own words does not effectively identify AI written words, but these open-source systems are developing their evaluation software packages to define what is AI language versus what is that. But some discussions are occurring at upper levels at the University-wide, and I think that the question for us is whether we see what those policies are, what they do develop or decide or do we move forward and try to develop our kind of recommendation to, in tangent or parallel with those policies.

Lakshmanan: I just want to add that, in addition to that academic misconduct relating to plagiarism which includes entity along with the person that is submitting the work of another person or entity as your own, that is also another issue that our committee discussed, and that is in E, which relates to academic freedom. So, professors have a certain freedom on what instructions are given, and what the requirements for any given assignment are. So, that is covered by E in that, it says, "violating any restriction on collaboration which has been duly communicated by an instructor via a syllabus, or otherwise, in writing or orally in the course of instruction." So, this would mean that no instructors may be exactly alike, like somebody may allow a certain AI tool but they would have indicated in their syllabus some kind of restriction. So, they are free to do that, and that clause also allows for that and covers the academic freedom of instructors.

Allen: I guess on the center, I do not understand why we are reluctant to add language specifically forbidding AI versions of papers, inevitably I feel somebody is going to try this, be it at the graduate or the undergraduate level, and make the argument that entity does not cover AI, make the argument that it is my work, because I commanded it to be produced, and I think we could foster all of that by simply adding language that says specifically and directly that artificial intelligence is covered by this policy and it is not allowed directly. To your point Usha about academic freedom, I do not think that saying the substituting work without acknowledging that it is AI work infringes upon that academic

freedom. I think that if we include language stating that professors do not mind it coming in or being used within their syllabus, it just needs to be acknowledged in the same way that citing a piece of work is, that this is not my original production, I may have commanded this to be produced, whatever else; but I am not the one who offered this work.

Lakshmanan: I do agree with you. I think if that is an issue of misinterpretation, there could be a time in the future when people do not extend that term to apply to these cases, then it may help our students and faculty also to clarify that. The only thing is that it should not be worded in such a way that it is viewed as something that an instructor could potentially restrict. So, an instructor may decide. I am not going to allow this given the nature of my cause if you understand.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I think whenever we are dealing with this kind of policy development and in an education setting, part of it is, how can faculty help students understand which of these technologies might be appropriate, and which is not, which requires them to be aware of what is out there, and I think that is one of the things that is sort of difficult. So, as I was thinking through this, I went about the web and the best sort of survey that I could find is the link that I put in the chat, now I will say that this is a zoom, and there are unusual zoom disruptions and it is not the easiest thing to watch, and really about that. It is like watching the haunted sort of zoom, in a way, with people not being muted and so on. But it did introduce me to several different kinds of AI Dissertation, and thesis assistance that I did not even know existed and that might be on me but I do think that because I have been reflecting on it, I know this is the kind of thing, Karen, that you might talk with the directors of graduate studies about, so that they are aware of that and maybe the units can think about how to talk about it with their faculty, discipline by discipline. There are other models that we might encourage, like a disclosure statement that we do when we are talking about conflict of interest or funding, and a research paper asking students to disclose the AI that they use and trying to frame that as a scholarly responsibility. When I watch some of these things happen, and I think about some of my dissertation's advice availing themselves with some of these tools, I am kind of uncomfortable especially if I do not know because they are quite various in relationship to summarizing articles, generating literature reviews, academic phrase, and word banks that will rewrite your sentences in academies of a variety of different kinds of things.

Tsatsoulis: As with every new technology, we are looking at the dangers that the technology brings, but I must tell you that I am seeing more uses of it, and I mean positive use and Craig might have just implied that. Even in proposal writing, it is something that funding agents right now are starting to deal with, if part of your proposal has been written by ChatGPT, is it your work? It is going to take a while for everybody to figure out how to move forward and this is not going to be constrained, as I mentioned last time to just the written word but it is also hard, it is a lot of different things, It is any kind of activity where big data can be used, so I guess all I can say is stay tuned and that both good and bad will come from it.

McCarroll: I just wanted to add to what Costas was saying. If we are not careful, we could end up with a policy that would prevent someone doing genetic sequencing from using bioinformatics to complete their research. So, it is very nuanced how we produce a set of rules that both prevent or achieve what we want but then do not have an anticipated constraint.

Allen: I do not think it would be right to craft a policy that outlaws it. I was thinking about maybe somebody unable to see, speaking their words to a computer and writing in that fashion and also, I was thinking about qualitative work where people will hire a transcription service, somebody else to transcribe an interview or something like that, and is that considered not your work, I think, nuanced as you said, Matt is the term. I do strongly feel that if we do not have some kind of policy to stand on, we are going to find ourselves revisiting this as an institution in the future, and it is going to be a problem.

Lakshmanan: If I may, I just wanted to say that already we do have people working collaboratively, and it is not clear at all about that the result, and whose name goes on It reflects that, you know we have like lads working together, and so many issues and this also applies to faculty. This kind of thing already exists, so the essential problem has to do with how an entity is interpreted. If someone does not interpret it right in the broadest way possible, then that is a problem. So, if at all, we must protect, and be more flexible for any future situations, then I think we should explain that entity could include things as such. So at least, there is some understanding, and some people do not interpret an entity as meaning someone who is a human agent. right? Because corporations could be entities already in a court of law and I must say, like even in research, people develop stimuli and are using things that are already there to create certain materials, for example,

if I work with children's acquisition, then I may use pictures and things that are already available and put them together in this new way. So, we are already all doing that, but the essential problem is that we should prevent anyone from interpreting an entity too narrowly.

Brooten: I just wanted to say that I have been going to a couple of the ChatGPT discussions that were posted at the bottom of Andy's report to the Executive Council. ChatGPT discussions are going on right now at the University of Illinois, Springfield, and they are open Zoom sessions. There is one today from 1pm to 2pm and they are also recorded and available on the website. So, the one today is called what problems may be created by ChatGPT and how can we control or limit them? I have been at two and they were mostly talking about how ChatGPT is being used in the remarkably interesting stuff and you know for example, one person said that they assigned their students to have a paper written by ChatGPT and then actually analyzed it. So, they were talking about the context of training graduate students who are going to be teachers, and it is a useful discussion, so if anyone is interested, we could find the link and send it. I just wanted to point out that there are lots of interesting stuff being done already in terms of using it in the classroom.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thanks Lisa, from my perspective, this is sort of an opening of a conversation in some ways here, and Karen do you think it would be appropriate to talk to the dawgs and the directors of the graduate studies and ask them to talk with their units about this because I think if we are going to avail ourselves of the syllabus policy, whatever in relationship to faculty, autonomy academic freedom in terms of what we will not accept, or the conversations that we want to have with people about, the AI that they have found, and potentially using a full disclosure conversation kind of ways, if we are going to use that at least until an official policy comes down as a way of having these conversations with students, it is worth talking to the dawgs about encouraging graduate faculty to put that in syllabi.

Jones: I am happy to take it to the dawgs. I was thinking that with several of the Deans here Eric and Dr. Morgan, even if it comes down through multiple channels, through administrative routes, it could even be something that goes on a syllabus attachment since we have a syllabus attachment that goes out anyway. If we could develop some language to include there that might be an approach as well.

Brevik: It could be, although bear in mind that recent surveys demonstrate that very few of our students read their syllabus, and we need to talk about it at some point in time as an institution. I know that we say if we put up this obviously, you're responsible for it and then we can't, you will come back and say, well, okay, you messed up because you did this, and it was on my syllabus, but we probably also need to find a more effective way to put things in front of students because the syllabus, the studies are showing the syllabus is not doing it.

Anaza: I also want to add that some professors take their syllabus quite seriously. I know several that spent an entire day to quiz their students on their syllabus just to make sure that they understand different aspects of the syllabus. So, while it is not the most effective, there are professors that are figuring out ways to get the student's attention to the information.

Lakshmanan: I just want to say that one can think of creating an animated video with the tools of AI, to inform the student body and the faculty. It could be a fun video about these things that have now entered our lives and are here to stay, and we must live with them. How we acknowledge that becomes an issue? People need to know, so for the widest student body and faculty, we could create a nice short video that at least alerts people, too.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I think the background in all of this is the idea that there are probably some faculty who are unaware of the extent, particularly if some of these sorts of smaller helper tools outlined in that video, so that we can have conversations because there are different dimensions of this, one is sort of legalistic, preemptory kind of question put it in the syllabus. One is an educational question; what kinds of experiences some of these elements can afford to people who are working on a dissertation that we might want them to be able to have access to? So how different is it in some ways that my asking students to run, dissertation chapters through Grammarly, or something like that as a way of assisting them? There are lots of questions here but if the faculty is aware of it, then we are ready to help shape the system-wide dialogues and campus-wide dialogue that may be being had at some of these fire and administrative levels so that when policies get written we have a more informed hand in them. So, the dawgs are a good way to get that started if you are willing to add that to that group, Karen. Are there other comments about this issue in a way starting our conversation about it, with the hope of being in some place

at the end of the semester where we can point to what our response is, even if that is more of a guideline than a policy?

Gingrich-Philbrook: Okay? Ryan.

Netzley: Has anybody in this group graded, the literature review produced by ChatGPT? I mean seeing one evaluate it and not know it.

Gingrich-Philbrook: That might be epistemological, kind of question. I am not sure if I have or have it.

Netzley: So, I tried this thing out in the fall, and I do not know that this is necessarily right for all fields, but what they produce is crap and I know I do not have a stake in the policy discussion but I do have a question about whether our sort of breathless concern is not necessarily a policy matter but it might be a matter about how we evaluate work, and at what standards we evaluate it, because if the things that pass muster and generated through iterative pattern recognition and bad readings of scholarly work because that is what it is. They are bad readings of work passed off as summary statements about them. We need to look at our evaluative procedures. I think not necessarily the policing mechanism that we use on top of it. That means much higher standards for what a literature review is, and I do not know that this body does that, but it seems to me that if we have not seen the thing both graduate and for that matter, at the undergraduate level and graded it. The idea that it produces B-plus work is false even at the undergraduate level. unless we are just asking them to produce Wikipedia entries because that is what it does. I am not saying we all must revise our assignments, but I do think we might want to take the press as what it is as a marketing device to get us all to put in our assignment prompts. which you know I did and so the more you feed it, the more it learns and reproduces and knows what you are trying to ask for. It only can respond to synthesis assignments at the undergraduate level. It cannot do analysis, it cannot read a poem, and it cannot read anything written before 1985, so, any sort of irony or sort of understatement or litotes, it cannot read, it misunderstands it. So that means, I guess, that there are all sorts of ways to grade the thing that does not come upon the problem about which we are talking. So that is what I have to say about that.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I think part of the thing coming out of that is the question of are we becoming aware of it right? and as I am reading around in this part of the concern is about how it evolves and trying to get ahead of how it learns what it is that we want. So, remember we are not just talking about one program, right? There are a variety of different AI tools that people use and some of the smaller ones that are in that video, it is hard for me to evaluate, because I am not a scientist, and they are using scientific examples, right? so, I do not know how tinny those summaries might appear to someone in the discipline but they make a kind of sense that did not stand out to me necessarily as false. I feel like I would have a sense that advising had used to them because I hopefully have a sense of how unadvised sees writing.

Allen: Just to Ryan's point. I agree that a lot of what comes out of these AI things is indeed crap, but I do not have a Ph.D. In English and some of the stuff that has been submitted to me by undergraduates over the past few years of teaching is worse than what I have seen come out of those ChatGPT. So, it is not a matter of necessarily evaluating things properly, although you know I will agree that things should be evaluated better in many cases. I think it is a matter of understanding that this technology is constantly evolving and the whole point is, you may have read stuff from an AI, and not realized that the assistance was there, so to say that it is not capable of writing, acceptable work specifically at the undergraduate or high school level, I do not think is accurate but that's just me.

Bacon: I teach a 200-level undergraduate course that has three specific papers. They are reflective papers, but students are required to cite sources, they are required to use textual references, and I suspect that since last November I have had several papers submitted that were produced by ChatGPT and I would agree with Ryan. I can tell the difference between a 200-level, poorly written, or paper, or by a developing academic writer and thinker versus a paper that is constructed by ChatGPT that cannot reflect on the chapters that were written, and the ideas that were produced in the readings in any way that reflects an understanding of the material, it seems to have its voice that is not reflective and when we talk about synthesis, if we are talking about synthesizing readings from specific materials from what I am seeing it misses the mark. So, there is a very clear difference between something that is originally written, at least from what I am seeing so far, which is not a lot, maybe five or six papers, but from something that is written even

by a developing writer and thinker versus a sophisticated AI tool that does not have the textual knowledge of the core of the readings of the discussions of the assignments that have gone into producing that. There is a real difference and I agree with Ryan. It goes back to our evaluation of those texts, and how well we know our students. On the other hand, I recently worked with a doctoral student, I chaired the Dissertation Committee, who was very, very intelligent, very conscientious, but who is still struggling with English, and so I gave him a phrase book to help him construct his writing and introduce some of his sentences to think about how a reader would interpret his writing. And so again, on the other hand, I do not see the difference between handing someone a phrase book and having a digital tool to support that kind of writing which was able to help him produce a more coherent dissertation. So, my thoughts.

Lakshmanan: I just wanted to say that where AI is concerned, there are so many levels of this, right? So, like when you do a simple spell check or check for grammar, and of course, this plays a key role in language classes. Also relating to this literature review, an essay, and the like, it could also serve as a learning tool. As Jeremy pointed out, if their way of framing the information is at a lower level, even compared to what you get out of these sources, then maybe that could be used as a tool from which they can learn. That is one way of looking at it and I think that we need to rethink, not just evaluation, but also what type of assignments we are giving them as Ryan mentioned that there could be things that do not necessarily involve putting together information from different sources, but something that is actively engaging the student in certain types of analysis, seeing patterns, those kinds of assignments may need to come to the forefront to beat the competition we are facing from AI. No longer can we just give assignments where we are having the students write a literature review, but some kind of analysis of a problem looking for patterns and that does not necessarily have to do with just evaluation but as a way of learning itself.

Gingrich-Philbrook: As I have been reflecting on it when we started having this conversation and moved it into education policies, from my perspective the key thing for me is that if we are thinking about it at the level of evaluation, then as we have been talking about, it needs to be in the prompt, and if it is in the prompt for the assignment or the description of the assignment, then we can start a conversation that is disciplined, appropriate, with students about their use of it, so that we are aware of what they are

using, and ask them, to make those disclosures, perhaps and I am thinking here particularly given our purview of graduate students and what it means to prepare an academic article, and certainly that is going to vary by disciplines. I completely understand Heidi the value of the phrase book, but when I am talking about these programs, that sort of do the translating into any kind of academies, there are subtle nuances in the use of that language that I want students to understand, and particularly when they are working on a dissertation that I do not think they do, if I get something from one of these sources that requires me to explain in the margins, in a couple of paragraphs about how this is not the appropriate use of this term, and all of that, but it is being brought in by phrase book just kind of from the standpoint of advising weight and faculty attrition. I do not want to have to deconstruct all the foolishness brought in by ChatGPT. So, I am interested really in the conversation, and how we can facilitate awareness in the graduate faculty and potentially offer ways to help them have those conversations with the support of the graduate school, as we go forward, and these technologies evolve.

Bacon: I agree, we need that support from the graduate school and the university system, and I also agree with you. On the other hand, I love the fact that my students, my Doc students, my grad students, and the undergrad students with whom I work want to play with language, and I appreciate that playing with language and with those phrases, I think those are great conversations to have especially with our Doc students because they are publishing in journals where they are seeing some of this language. So, it is a fine line, and these conversations are generative.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I appreciate everyone's willingness to have this conversation, but I see we are having members drop out because of having to go, so I if I can, I would like to go ahead and move us to the other three reports from the committees.

Wilber: Sorry, Craig, before we do that, I just want to summarize both quickly, so that I can get back to my group of members on the grievance process. So, you and Usha will draft a step-by-step, SOP for review by the group participating.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Yes. We will look at what we did last year, coming out of the committee that we were on, and then translate that into steps as best as we can, so that we can incorporate anything that you learned about the difficulty of carrying out that

procedure, Andy. What we should do is have a new resolution, which would go forward through the process that Andrew has given us. Does that sound okay to you?

Wilber: Okay, sounds great. Thank you. As far as AI is concerned, at this point, I still do not know what to do or what to say.

Gingrich-Philbrook: I think your committee has done its work, and you have given us some things to think about, and we have to wait for the system, declaration, and relationship to any kind of policy. So, in lieu of that, my understanding is that we will work to make sure that the directors of graduate studies have a good understanding of these possibilities through dawgs and encourage faculty to have conversations with graduate students, since that is our purview, particularly about these culminating documents like thesis and dissertations in the role of AI. So, I do not think you have to do anything coming out of your committee at this point. I think you have done a good job of helping us see what some of the issues are, and how they are coming to fruition because of the various actions that the system is taking. I would encourage members to take advantage of some of the resources to explore a little bit online and find the ones that are probably most likely to be used by students in your discipline partly from the standpoint of self-defense, but also partly from the standpoint of the generative quality that some of these can have and ways that you might want to encourage their use. Let us hear from Heidi Bacon from new programs committee.

Report from New Programs Committee: Heidi Bacon

Bacon: Hello, everyone, Thank you. I will keep my report very brief. New programs considered NUI for the Master of Accountancy program. The committee did have questions, and we asked for more clarification regarding the proposed program. So, we are arranging a discussion to have those questions answered. We also have three new RME's which we will be reviewing next week, and after spring break, and should have reached a decision or resolution before our next meeting. I also want to thank the members of the Committee for being so attentive to the mass number of emails as we considered this and got together to meet. So, we look forward to hearing from the

programs, so we can have our questions answered. That is all I have, are there any questions?

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you, Heidi. Lilliana, from research.

Report from Research Committee: Liliana Lefticariu

Lefticariu: My report is short. We received a couple of applications for a research instrumentation program. The deadline for submission was the end of February, two days ago. I will be sending out the proposal to the committee for evaluation and putting together a report for the VCR with our recommendation. So, this is all I have, are there any questions?

Tsatsoulis: I just wanted to thank you for doing that. I know it takes them up a lot of time, but I appreciate you doing that and the committee.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you, Liliana. Lisa from program review.

Report from Program Review Committee: Lisa Brooten

Brooten: We still have no charge, so I have the report. It sounds like a broken record.

Gingrich-Philbrook: We got out of cycle on those, but at least my understanding is that the setting up of next year's program review is going to happen at the end of spring, and so you may be hearing from Andrew as part of that process. Is there anything else that members would like to raise?

Tsatsoulis: Just an announcement, tomorrow, as you know, from 10 am to noon, we are organizing a workshop to inform our faculty about submitting proposals to agencies outside NSF. That is a panel of faculty who have been successful in submitting proposals to different agencies. So, if you have not done so, please come.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you.

Adjournment

Gingrich-Philbrook: Is there a motion to adjourn?

Anaza: so, moved.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you, A second.

Netzley: Second.

Gingrich-Philbrook: Thank you, take care, everyone, and thank you for the work you did today.

Meeting adjourned at 9:38 AM