

MEETING OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
March 5, 2009

Members and Administrative Officers Present:

Thomas Britton; Ronald Browning; Daniel Dyer; Ann Fletcher; Ramesh Gupta; Eric Hellgren; Nicholas Hoffman (GPSC); Andrew Hofling; Scott Ishman; Mark Kittleson; Elizabeth Klaver, John Koropchak, Leslie Lloyd; Shawna Macdonald (GPSC); Pat Manfredi; Scott McClurg; Eileen Meehan; Christian Moe (Emeritus); Manoj Mohanty; Nancy Mundschenk; Donna Post; Elyse Pineau; Karen Renzaglia; Jacob Rose; Peggy Stockdale (Faculty Senate); Karl Williard; David Wilson (Graduate School); Bryan Young; Michael Young; and Carmen Suarez (A/P Council).

Members and Administrative Officers Absent:

Sam Goldman; Pru Rice; Tomasz Wiltkowski; Bill Stevens.

Chairman Britton called the meeting to order on March 5, 2009 at 8:00 a.m. in the Kaskaskia/Missouri Room of the Student Center.

Announcement of Proxies: David Wilson announced that Carmen Suarez is representing the A/P Council in place of Bill Stevens and Professor Mohanty will serve as proxy for Professor Wiltkowski.

1. **Consideration of the minutes of the February 5, 2009.**

Tom Britton asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of February 5. Prof. Dyer indicated that the minutes reflect his attendance, but he was not present. In addition, Scott Ishman, Ron Browning and Manoj Mohanty indicated they were also present, not their proxy, as indicated in the minutes. Tom Britton had a minor correction, but will let Donna know after the meeting. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes, with the corrections noted above, was made by Elyse Pineau and seconded by Dan Dyer; motion passed.

2. **Remarks/Announcements:**

a. **University and Graduate School Leadership**

Provost Rice:

Provost Rice had nothing to report at this time.

Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Dean John Koropchak

VCR Koropchak stated the opportunities at the federal level for opportunities for faculty to seek support from the federal government are unprecedented in his lifetime. The federal stimulus bill includes significant sums that will affect higher education including \$39.5 billion in direct aid to States for higher education assistance. Pell Grants have increased by \$17 billion. There is also more funding for the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes for Health. There is also \$39 billion dollars for energy and energy-related activities that we, as scholar and researchers, might want to access. He added that most of these dollars will be awarded based on their usual peer-review process. In this regard, NIH is reconsidering unfunded proposals received last year. Email messages have been sent to faculty who submitted proposals to NIH last year asking them to contact their program officers. The National Science Foundation recently resurrected a program that was in place until 1995 that supports infrastructure improvements such as renovations. Other new programs include \$10 - \$15 million for the development and enhancement of professional science masters degrees which may help SIUC's soon-to-be approved Professional Science Master's in Advanced Energy and Fuels Management. An informational workshop was held last Friday at the student center which generated a lot of interest and good discussion. There are links on the ORDA and OVCR websites to access the ARRA website including an RSS portal. More workshops are being planned to include break-out sessions focused on selected topics such as energy. Dr. Koropchak noted that the Energy Department has been slower to develop their guidelines in how they will be spending their money. As these new programs develop, additional workshops will be held to provide more information.

In addition to the stimulus plan, there is also an Omnibus Budget Bill that provides increases for agencies to create even more opportunities for funding. He added this is an unprecedented time and the right time to be submitting proposals. Grant opportunities include the whole spectrum including grant opportunities for the National Endowment for the Arts which will be funded through state programs. He asked if anyone has ideas on how we can better help their access to information regarding these programs to contact him.

VCR Koropchak announced that the annual Research Town Meeting is being scheduled for April. He distributed copies of the draft informational flyer outlining activities included in the Research Town Meeting. This overlaps with the federal stimulus bill. A tentative list of agencies' program officers that will be attending is included in the flyer. VCR Koropchak stated that a morning and afternoon session is being

scheduled for program officers to give maximum opportunity for faculty and staff to interact with program officers. A list of agency program officers who will be attending includes representatives from NSF, Illinois Arts Council, and NIH. As in past town meetings, a poster session will be held. We hope to have everything finalized within the next couple of weeks. He asked them everyone to please let him know if they have other ideas for the Research Town Meeting.

Good News. For the second time, one of our undergraduate scholars was chosen to attend “Posters on the Hill,” an activity in Washington DC to be held on May 5. Andrew Denhart from Zoology will be one of 60 students nationwide who have been selected as part of a group of young scholars. In addition, Professor Paul Chugh has recently been awarded two awards from the Society of Mining Metallurgy and Exploration.

Associate Dean Wilson

Associate Dean Wilson announced an addendum to the Professional Science Masters program that will be approved by the Board of Trustees in May or June. We have been notified that there an earmark of \$428,000 is in the current federal budget for SIUC’s PSM program.

He also announced that it is election time again for the Graduate Council. There will be elections in Agricultural Sciences; Applied Sciences and Arts; Education and Human Services, Liberal Arts and the School of Medicine. Nomination Ballots will be out next week or right after break. He asked the Council members to talk to their colleagues about this process so that we may identify good people for the Council

The Morris Fellowship offers have gone out and the Doctoral offers will be out soon. The Master’s process will start right after break, which we hope to get that done as quickly as we can.

b. Constituency Leadership

Faculty Senate – Prof. Stockdale.

Prof. Stockdale announced the Faculty Senate will be meeting the Tuesday after break. We have a number of resolutions to be considered at that time. We will be considering the Interim Title resolution that will be entertained by the Graduate Council today. The Faculty Senate and Graduate Council have formed a joint committee to consider the use of interim titles at SIU. We will also be considering a resolution on the use of the disciplinary and termination for cause policy with regard to post tenure review. We have another resolution to support the philosophy of

the first year experience. We are also in the middle of elections for the Faculty Senate and are attempting to do this electronically. We are in the process of calling for nominations and you have probably gotten an email asking for nominations. If you have not already responded, the deadline is the end of this week.

A/P Staff Counsel – Bill Stevens

Carmen Suarez, filling in for Bill Stevens, had no report.

Graduate Student Professional Council – Alejandro Strong

Alejandro Strong reported that the main discussion at the last meeting of the GSPC centered around increases in housing costs and housing conditions for graduate students on campus. We also talked about graduate student enrollment and international students with regard to the pricing and conditions of on-campus housing for graduate students. We voted against an increase in fees and tuition and also complained about not having internet in the graduate dorms. He stated that although the GPSC has voted against these increases, we have not had an impact on the decisions and we may need some help.

Ramesh Gupta asked if the GPSC had questioned why the 8 a.m. saluki express bus service from Southern Hills was cut from the schedule. Ramesh reported that some students are having difficulty getting to class because of the decision to cut the early bus. Chairman Britton asked if GPSC has taken up the issue with Housing. Strong stated that the GPSC pressed them on the bus issue when they came to talk about the increases. We were told there was an expanded bus service and they had to change some routes to go out to the Mall. Dean Wilson asked if they had spoken with Julie Kirchmeyer, the director of housing. Strong said they have spoken to her about the issue of no internet service available in Wakeland Hall by the Law School to which she responded that the building has concrete walls and a router would have to be put in every room to have internet access. In addition, she said the building is scheduled to be destroyed. However, we did not get a full explanation as to why the cost is the same as housing with internet. He added that the GPSC does press Housing on these issues, but it seems the decisions go through even when we vote them down. VCR Koropchak suggested that the GPSC contact him when they have these issues so that he can help mediate or get engaged in these issues as they come up.

3. **Committee Reports**

a. Executive Committee – Chairman Britton

Tom Britton reported he has been serving on a pre-chancellor search committee. This committee consists of members from each of the major constituencies. He reported this committee is trying to pre-identify potential candidates for the chancellor position. The Committee has been looking at provosts and chancellors at peer education institutions and other institutions with a higher profile than ours. We are also taking a look at people that have been suggested. The Committee is developing a set of individuals that might be interested in the position for the search committee, when it is formed, to pursue. Thus far, we have identified about 300 people and we have worked that group down substantially. Once the search committee has been formed, other people can nominate and apply. We have also been working on a position description and website for the search committee. The hope is to achieve some transparency through the website whereby we can talk about the search and report back to you. We are trying to do some of the advance work that a consulting firm might have done. This work is ongoing and we have met several times and I think we are making some progress. The person convening the meetings is former Vice President John Haller. As the search committee is formed and more information is available, we will let you know.

b. Nomination Committee – Prof. Hellgren

Professor Hellgren had no nominations to report.

c. Research Committee – Prof. Renzaglia

Announcement of Resolution

Prof. Renzaglia reported that the Research Committee met and discussed the distribution of overhead. She noted the reason for considering the distribution of overhead and adjusting it was because last year we were looking at a program to reward researchers for getting outside funding. We thought the best way to deal with this issue was to look at the distribution of indirect cost and designate a percentage that would go back to the researcher. In addition, we were extremely concerned about the journal cuts to the library. A copy of the proposed resolution was distributed. The resolution was read by Professor Renzaglia.

Whereas, Southern Illinois University Carbondale is classified as a Doctoral/Research-Extensive (High Research Activity) University;

Whereas, funded external research grants and contracts are important aspects of faculty research;

Whereas, funded research typically generates indirect costs (IDC) and the current guideline for distributing IDC at SIUC has been in place for several years;

Whereas, IDC supports Facilities and Administration necessary to conduct research and the library is a critical facility for faculty and students to conduct research and remain informed;

Whereas, the impending acquisition cuts to Morris Library pose a serious threat to research graduate studies and the goals of Southern@150;

Whereas, recognition for grant success is thought to be an important incentive for researchers to seek external funding;

Whereas, at present, there is no specific return of indirect costs to the researcher nor is there sufficient return to the library;

Therefore, the Research Committee of the Graduate Council proposes the following redistribution of IDC that reflects the needs of the library and rewards the researcher.

Current	Proposed
39% Vice Chancellor for Research 31% Chancellor 30% to the College	36% Vice Chancellor for Research 31% Chancellor No less than 4% of the total to the library 33% to the College No less than 6% goes back to the researcher

Discussion

A discussion ensued whereby the council members wanted the percentages specified more clearly. There was also a general consensus that the resolution must spell out what percentages goes to the VCR, chancellor, library, college, department and researcher. Professor Young stated that what concerns him is the unintended consequence of changing the policy, which means the VCR will not have as much to provide matching funds. In other words, the rich get richer and the people who need that seed money may end up with nothing. It was also unclear as to what the current policy actually states. VCR Koropchak said he chaired the committee organized by Chancellor Argersinger to investigate the distribution of IDC. At that time, 80% went to the Chancellor and 20% went to the college. One of the changes made was to take 10% of that return and give it the college to give at least 10% to the department. Chairman Britton asked if the existing policy was on line. VCR Koropchak stated it can be made available.

VCR Koropchak remarked that IDC is a complicated issue. There is not a lot of substance in this resolution that addresses the issues, i.e., funded research

grants and contracts. This focus is on research grants. He noted that less than half of what we get in IDC is from funded research grants. There are staff people who generate grants with IDC who are not faculty. Prof. Renzaglia stated she could modify the language to specify faculty/staff or P.I. rather than researcher.

VCR Koropchak stated that the committee he chaired met many times and had many discussions to arrive at the current IDC policy. He was concerned that there are many issues being mixed in with this resolution, such as the library. He also added that the Chancellor is planning a meeting to look at the Library and the issue of journals. He questioned whether this resolution will have any impact.

Dean Carlson stated, at this time, anything would help but the proposed 4% from IDC would not solve our problem. Carlson said that presently he gets 2.5% of what is given to the VCR. This results in about \$50,000 a year to the library. He added that they have used these allocations to cover the costs to transfer to books back and forth between the library and temporary book storage at the McLafferty building while the library was being renovated.

VCR Koropchak said sending these additional dollars to the library was something started 3 or 4 years ago with the intent that as the research enterprise grew, that fund would also grow. The idea was to have a percentage targeted into the library. He understood that this was to match what the Chancellor gives to the library. Carlson stated he was not aware of that stipulation.

Prof. Renzaglia noted that she thinks rewarding researchers is very important and that the Committee thought the issue of allocating 4% from IDC to the library was reasonable.

Professor Dyer was concerned that the resolution speaks to only researchers using the professional journals, and we need to specify that professional journals and publications are also a teaching tool used by both teachers and students. He would like to see that specified in the resolution. He thinks the most important issue we have right now is professional journals and publications being cut from the library. He stated that he thought we should resolve the library issue before we start on IDC.

VCR Koropchak suggested we have an advantage right now to tap into what the School of Medicine did. The School of Medicine went through an extensive planning process and developed extensive plans for their own version of the IDC distribution process. There is a lot of detail on how they implemented such a plan. They have already started their process and made their first distributions in December. The PI may elect to receive return of IDC as added income or as another type of assistance, such as travel. He added that, as a next step in the School of Medicine's plan, he has been working with the College of Medicine and Applied Research Consultants to generate a summary that would provide data to see if goals are being achieved. They will use those results to

revise the plan to better help achieve those goals. He thinks this is valuable information that should be used in further developing this resolution, adding this would be a significant investment in resources that would need to have a payoff based on the goals of what that plan would be. The over-arching goal should be to help make the university better. How we move along that path should be considered in any kind of plan. He stated he would be happy to work with the Research Committee on further developing this idea.

Professor Renzaglia stated we have been discussing and working on this for over a year and it seems so difficult to implement. The Committee thought this resolution was the simplest and most direct way of dealing with it.

VCR Koropchak reminded the Graduate Council that there is only one person on this campus who can change the IDC distribution and that is the Chancellor.

VCR Koropchak stated that under the current policy, it is entirely up to the colleges to determine how the IDC is distributed. It is a broad spectrum and varies across campus. There have been some colleges that give part back to the PI and some that have reversed that decision to keep it more centrally to use as a pool of funds to be distributed on an as-needed basis. There are many variations across campus on how this is currently being done.

There was general consensus that there is a need to look at providing incentives for researchers. Mark Kittleson reported that several years ago he had discussions with a number of people including the Vice Chancellor about creative ways to provide incentives to researchers. There are many universities that double and triple a researcher's salary by getting outside funding. The University of Chicago has some really innovative ways whereby faculty can double or triple their income. The School of Medicine also has developed ways to reward researchers. We need to expand this and look at activities that the School of Medicine and other universities are already doing. He encouraged that if we want to do this, we must provide real incentives to researchers to go after and get grants.

Chairman Britton proposed that we leave this issue on the agenda and bring it up again next month. He asked Professor Renzaglia and the Research Committee to meet with Dr. Koropchak to discuss these issues. VCR Koropchak will make available the current policy available on the Graduate Council website. We need a baseline from which to have our discussions before we can continue. The issue is very complex and he is not sure we can solve it this year. He asked the Council's approval to leave these items on the agenda so that we can revisit this next month.

Prof. Dyer reiterated the seriousness of cutting professional journals from the library. He has been corresponding with various members of the Library and

the Dean and is encouraged to see that the library is being considered for 4% of IDC. He would like to see the Council separate the issue of the library from IDC as a separate agenda item at the next meeting.

Chairman Britton stated we will separate these issues in the agenda for the next meeting. He would like to see what the current policy is before we have further discussions. He added that perhaps the Chancellor will be in attendance to share his view.

Prof. Dyer explained that he wants to make everyone understand how demoralizing it is to have the journal cuts and added that these are journals that directly affect his research and are journals in which he publishes.

VCR Koropchak said that this problem is not unique to SIU and said he has heard stories about library cuts at Stanford. He understands it is a big problem and we need to find solutions and but it may take something much bigger than an IDC allocation.

Prof. Browning suggested that the library problem is a huge issue and the Education Policies Committee should also be in on the discussions with the Research Committee. Chairman Britton asked that the Education Policies Committee also meet with the Research Committee regarding this issue. VCR Koropchak added it might be helpful for them to include Dean Carlson.

Prof. Post offered a motion to accept Chairman Britton's suggestion that we address the issues of IDC and library cuts at the next meeting and that each will be discussed as a separate items. Motion seconded and passed.

d. Report of Ed. Policies Committee – Professor Manfredi

Prof. Manfredi had no report today. .

e. New Programs Committee – Professor Williard

VOTE ON RESOLUTION – Concurrent MPH/Ph.D. in Health Education

There were no questions or discussion. Motion to approve the resolution was made and resolution passed unanimously.

f. Program Review Committee – Professor Mundschenk

Prof. Mundschenk had no report at this time.

g. Committee on Interim Titles – Professor Kittleson

Chairman Britton announced that Prof. Kittleson chaired the committee to look at interim titles on campus. The Faculty Senate also created a committee to consider the same issue. The committees were merged. A proposal has come from that committee which was attached to the agenda. Chairman Britton asked Professor Kittleson to explain what the committee came up with.

Prof. Kittleson thanked everyone who served on this committee and added they were great people to work with.

Prof. Kittleson explained the committee's goal was to provide clarity on definitions regarding the use of interim and acting titles on campus. The Committee looked at current interim/acting positions and suggestions for resolving these issues. The Committee also suggested how the University would use interim titles in the future. He explained that the Committee understands we are just an advisory group, but we think there is a real concern about the number of interims on campus and how long the interims have been in positions.

The Committee feels that interim appointments should only be given when there is less than two or three weeks notice of a position being vacated. That interim position should last about three months, during which time there will be preparations to do an open search for a permanent person to fill the position. On the other hand if there is sufficient notice when someone is vacating a position, there is time to do an internal or national search to fill the position. We are proposing that at the level of Dean or above, if there is not sufficient time to do a national search, an internal search may take place. A time frame (approximately 12 months) will be set for the appointee selected through an internal search to occupy the position and he will be given the full title of Dean, etc. During these 12 months, a national search will be conducted. We think it is important to have a national search for these positions.

If we follow this protocol, we should see very few interims because if there is sufficient time a national search will take place. If no, an internal search will be held and the person appointed will hold the position during which time a national search will be held. We hope that the College Deans will also adopt these procedures and follow the same protocol for chairs or other positions in their respective colleges.

Regarding the current interim or acting positions on campus, the Committee recognized that Southern Illinois University has many persons appointed to interim positions on campus. We are proposing that, assuming they meet the specified requirements and the individuals have demonstrated they can do the job, the term "interim" would be removed

from the title. The Committee agreed that there needs to be some type of assessment of their status and that the primary constituency groups are also supportive. These procedures would eliminate the concern by many that a “good old boy” or “good old girl” would be put into positions without a search.

There was discussion about potential problems and the concern that some people may retain their interim position on a permanent basis without a proper search. There were also suggestions to rephrase a few of the comments. Another question was how the process would begin and who would make the decisions.

A suggestion was made by Prof. Post that we include language in the proposal that require Deans also follow these same procedures with regard to filling positions. Her concern is that someone gets appointed with the understanding they will remain at the university for another year and leave or retire and time has passed during which deans and provost positions have changed, and the person is in the position for 4 or 5 years and no search was ever conducted.

Prof. Kittleson explained that the committee spent a lot of time on this and understands that colleges may have their own protocol and a lot of times, the department is so small that there may be only one person qualified. He explained that is the reason they stayed at the Dean’s level or above with the hope that the deans would take this as a nice format to follow. He will add a statement to strongly encourage College Deans to follow the same protocol whenever possible.

Provost Rice suggested that at the beginning of the academic year we can ask the deans or directors to update their operating papers to allow some process whereby they can appoint interim and acting appointments. He also stated his concerns that he has had a number of areas where he has received an announcement of an appointment as a department chair with no paperwork indicating there was ever a search. Provost Rice stated that his office has been asking for more information regarding the search process for the appointment; and, in some cases, we have asked them to conduct a search for the position if one was not done.

Chairman Britton asked that we will leave this on the agenda for consideration next month during which time Professor Kittleson will bring this back in the form of a resolution. He also added that Professor Kittleson may want to take into consideration the Faculty Senate’s comments prior to writing the resolution.

4. **Old Business**

There was no old business.

5. **New Business**

The next meeting of the Graduate Council will take place on Thursday, April 9, 2009 at 8 a.m. in the Kaskaskia/Missouri Room of the Student Center.

There being no further business to bring before the Council, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded and passed unanimously; the meeting adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna L. Reynolds
Recording Secretary