Members and Administrative Officers:


Absent: Najjar Abdul-Musawwir, Amer AbuGhazaleh, Paul McGreal, Pat McNeil, John Mead, Jay Means, Manoj Mohanty, Joe Moore (GPSC) and Pamela Smoot.

In Attendance: Tina M. Price, Recording Secretary

Proceedings:

Meeting called to order at 8:00 am by Chairman Mundschenk in the Missouri and Kaskaskia Rooms of the Student Center located at 11255 Lincoln Drive, Carbondale, Illinois.

1. **Consideration of Minutes of the May 6, 2010 Graduate Council Meeting.**

   It was moved and seconded to accept the minutes, the motion passed unanimously.

2. **Remarks—Chancellor Rita Cheng**

   The Chancellor expressed a desire to learn more about the Council’s agenda not only today but throughout the year. Recognizing the good work done in program development, she emphasized that there be continued efforts to align program renewal to our faculty strengths and research agenda. This would include looking beyond our borders to an international strategy that has a two-way flow which would allow our students and researchers to connect in significant ways with our counterparts in other countries and open the doors for an inflow of graduate students to study at SIUC.

   In regard to the past fiscal and faculty hiring constraints, the Chancellor expressed a desire to move forward in a strategic way. She stated that deans have been encouraged to have recruitment plans in place and to look for more funding so that there is movement forward now and in the future to revitalize our faculty lines.

   The Chancellor emphasized the importance of supporting graduate student recruitment and a strategy to blend the professional graduate who will be paying tuition with their counterparts, those students needing support. Stating that healthy numbers were reported by the Graduate School, she encouraged continued momentum and development of new graduate programs to encourage students who may not have considered southern Illinois as a place to study and live.

   The Chancellor informed the council that her activities beyond graduate education and research are intended to provide a healthy undergraduate population because that in turn provides cross-subsidies to fund many activities on campus. She stated that there has been a decline over the years, causing additional stress on this campus over and above the state support decline. To get that back up, the Chancellor’s activities will involve reviewing the process by which we approach perspective students and parents, and the service we provide to assure those students are encouraged to remain.
The Chancellor challenged the faculty to think about how they approach student learning success in order to increase retention rates. With respect to the good graduate retention rates, we would also want this group to be looking at that data to be sure we are doing all we can to provide a good environment for graduate students. She advised that there are always going to be financial and family issues for graduate students, but we do not want the students leaving because they are disappointed in the experience.

In conclusion, the Chancellor expressed pleasure in being connected to the work of the Graduate Council and in working towards solving problems using the critical thinking of the entire faculty.

There being no questions, the Chairman expressed thanks to the Chancellor for partnering with the Graduate Council.

3. **Remarks—Interim Provost Don S. Rice**

Dr. Rice reported that while the university has been conservative in the way we look at hiring, there will be national search for permanent deans in the College of Engineering and the College of Liberal Arts as Dean Vaux will retire at the end of the academic year; paperwork and committees are now being put together.

Dr. Rice commented that while no new hires were contemplated, the Chancellor may wish to make some reorganizational moves.

In response to the question regarding the status of the concept of interim deans, as we have two remaining, Dr. Rice stated that the executive committee and the advisory board have reviewed and are satisfied with the performance of Interim Dean Owens, Applied Sciences and Arts. Upon his retirement by the middle of next year, there will be a national search. Additionally, indicators of the performance of Interim Dean Winters, Agricultural Sciences, were positive, with a national search being put off as well.

There were no further questions.

4. **Announcements**

**Vice Chancellor for Research John A. Koropchak**

Members were reminded of the traditional reception to welcome the new Graduate Council after the first meeting. The reception will be held at the home of Dr. Koropchak starting at 4:30 pm.

Dr. Koropchak shared preliminary indicators of what is happening in graduate education and research:

- $15 million of awards were processed in August, making for a very active month.
- Data on the awards from last fiscal year are still being processed, with a near record totaling somewhere around $74 to $75 million. This tops the year that included the $25 million one-time award for clean coal activities.
- At the end of two months we are at approximately $22 million, which is $6 million ahead of where we were last year. This is partly due to timing, in addition to the following awards:
  - $5 million grant in social work that came in earlier this year;
  - $1.8 million federal grant to Fisheries for research on Asian carp, well-publicized issue related to the introduction of the species into the great lakes;
  - $1.4 million NSF research grant related to climate change, particularly in the midwest; approximately 4-5 colleges involved.
• Graduate enrollment is at 4,109 as of September 2, up 60 from the 2009/2010 totals. Additionally, two colleges are working to enroll cohorts of 25 students before the tenth day deadline. This year’s enrollment will be somewhere between 4,100 and 4,150, which would be a significant increase in graduate enrollment. The council members were thanked for their efforts in that regard.

• The Apply Yourself application software is now live. It was noted that in the context of current graduate enrollment the software was not live, yet there was a little bit of growth. It was hoped that the software will facilitate the application process for students next year so that there may be improvement based on that as well.

• The Executive Committee has expressed interest in the preliminary survey submitted last spring by the Applied Research Consultants (ARCH) on Campus Research Climate. ARCH was asked to do a more in-depth analysis of the data. They have reported some delays due to staff changes, but we should be getting the final report soon.

Dr. Koropchak distributed copies of the flyer for the October 8th Technology Expo to the Council members. He stated that half a dozen inventors from the campus faculty will be giving presentations, in addition to presentations from authors, authors who are entrepreneurs, as well as venture capital leaders in the Midwest.

Good news was reported in US World News and Reports that we were ranked in the top tier of the Best National Universities. There are approximately 190 universities listed, and among publics we were ranked 101. This reflects a lot of good work by a lot of people on the campus.

There were a number of students and faculty recognized during the summer:

• Sadie Lovett and Brooke D. Walker of the Rehabilitation Institute won a research paper competition from the North American Meeting of the Association of Behavior Analysis International;
• Matthew Krampe, from Zoology, won the 2010 James E. Wright Graduate Award from the American Fisheries Society.
• Among other rankings, our Creative Writing Program was ranked 40th in the nation.

Dr. Koropchak conveyed his thanks and appreciation for the activities and service of Dr. Max Yen. Dr. Yen left the university in mid August for a position as Dean at another university. He was a leader of many of our Asian initiatives, as well as Director of the Materials Technology Center. There will be a retirement reception on September 13. Flyers will be sent out.

Associate Vice Chancellor Prudence Rice

Dr. Rice informed the Council that The National Science Foundation (NSF) issued a rule or regulation that, by January of this year, all universities receiving NSF funding were required to be able to certify they have a training program in Responsible Conduct of Research, generally known as RCR, that NSF proposals provide an indication that the training is in place, and that all post-doctoral and graduate students funded must go through this training.

This summer we subscribed to a program called CITI, Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative, developed by researchers at University of Miami with the Public Health Service. There is no cost to be a part of this online training program covering each of the required nine areas of responsible conduct in research. The Office of Research Administration is notified as each segment is completed, and is able to track what your post-doctoral and graduate students are doing. Dr. Rice informed the Council that ORDA also offers training workshops for research graduates at the beginning of each semester, with a large segment of the ORDA’s website devoted to this issue.
After a brief discussion regarding the frequency of testing and comparisons of the CITI and other online testing for research assistants, Dr. Rice advised departments to contact Steve Banker (ORDA) regarding testing requirements and to help to setup the training.

In response to questions of whether there are systems in place to assure compliance in training and/or whether departments need to come up with a system to assure compliance, Dr. Rice stated that post-doc graduate students funded by NSF must take this online training and are given a month to complete the certification. Other training is up to the departments.

Dr. Rice advised that there will be travel funding available this year. The funding will be split up so that half the money will be accounted for July 1 through December 31, and the second half will be awarded for travel taken January 1 through June 30.

In response to questions of who is funded and how to apply for the funds, Dr. Rice stated that the funds are intended for tenure and tenure track faculty and staff with research scientist appointments. It was emphasized that the travel funds are research focused; primarily for travelling to meetings where the faculty member will present research results. All the forms are available online.

In response to a question regarding ORDA travel funding requiring departmental matching funds, Dr. Rice stated that the goal is to provide travel funding. She added that funding will be $300, the usual amount, regardless of whether there are matching funds from the colleges.

There were no further questions.

Associate Dean David L. Wilson

Dr. Wilson advised that Apply Yourself is up and running, effective for spring 2011 applications. Ratna Sinha and Susan Babbitt (Graduate School) were thanked for their efforts, with additional thanks to Professor Mark Kittleson. He stated that there are plans next week to complete training and work with departments to allow adjustment to the system.

As the lead in the negotiations with Graduate Students United, Dr. Wilson informed the Council that those negotiations are ongoing and are now operating under the terms of the old contract which expires at the end of June.

Dr. Wilson reported on available funding:

- Students can apply online for travel funding; requires some type of matching fund.
- Departments wishing to bring in perspective students to campus can apply on a matching fund basis and the Graduate School usually provides $100-$200 depending on the case; funding based upon availability.
- There are limited dollars for faculty recruiting or wish to attend regional college recruitment fairs; we will pay for a motel and travel.

In response to a question regarding the types of affairs attended, Dr. Wilson stated these would include regional fairs and trips by the admissions director to Asia.

There were no further questions.
Associate Dean John S. Mead

No Report.

5. Announcements – Chairman Mundschenk

The Chair announced that the week of April 12 is targeted for the inauguration and installation ceremony of Chancellor Cheng. She, as a representative of the Graduate Council, and Dr. Koropchak are serving on the Inauguration Committee-at-Large.

The Chair requested ideas from the council and information on any ongoing activities occurring during that week, as well as key individuals to be invited or included in that ceremony. She emphasized the goal is that of showcasing the research activities, scholarly and creative activities on campus, Springfield and Chicago. It is hoped to draw attention to activities that are already going on at the campus and attempt to bundle these without additional costs. The following scholarly and creative activities were discussed: The Research Town Meeting; undergraduate research presentations that we can capitalize on; having an outstanding scholar or teacher for that year present a talk.

It was emphasized that any ideas or creative activities, any kind of input or feedback, be sent to the Chair or Dr. Koropchak.

The Chair distributed copies of the 2010-2011 Graduate Council Standing Committees, Graduate Council Membership E-Mail and Phone numbers, and Graduate Council Membership list. There was a brief discussion as corrections were made to the listings.

6. Faculty Senate—Professor Gary Apgar

Professor Apgar reported that the Faculty Senate will be addressing the following:

- Reviewing the Code of Conduct at the next Faculty meeting.
- Discussing the Education and Steering Committee Report that came out in an email from the Chancellor yesterday.
- Serious issues regarding the research and graduate student education opportunities.

7. Report from CPBAC—Professor Ishman

Professor Ishman reported that as far as the Graduate Council is concerned, the two main issues include:

- The Strategic Planning Mission which is a revisit of Southern at 150; looking at creating a more strategic plan.
- The Decision Center Subcommittee has been working and having discussions on ways we can retool the university; looking at ways in the future to cost-save since it looks as if the budget will not be getting any better.

The Chancellor interjected that there have been discussions with the deans and the Planning Budget Committee members about the way to move forward, perhaps even in a pilot basis with some very transparent revenue-sharing model. She stated that if there is growth in undergraduate enrollment, that very valid dollars would flow to the units that are generating those, and that would create an incentive structure in-house to recruit and retain students. She emphasized the point that enrollment can grow quite a bit very quickly and in many ways exponentially over four or five years, with enough to take-up even one percent of retention.
The Chancellor drew attention to our very low retention and graduation numbers compared to our peers. She stated that the good news is we have the asset base; the quality of faculty and the classroom size base to move forward.

- We have many classes that are small, less than 20 students compared to our peers.
- We have very few classes that are mass lecture compared to our peers.
- We have a very high percentage of fulltime faculty compared to our peers.

But our outputs and our outcomes are not what our peer institutions have. What we do need to look at is the process in place. Who is in the classroom and at what level to support the students, and what is going on outside of the classroom to support those students?

In response to the question whether there are total numbers for the ten-day enrollment for the university, Chancellor Cheng commented that it looked like it was going to be down by 1,000, but also confirmed that we have seen an up-tip. She stated that a note was sent out advising that we cannot bring in students on the 12th day when our peers report and are judged on enrollment on the 10th day. With Monday totals at 450 undergraduate level enrollments and with a possible uptake in the numbers of graduate students who are enrolling late, she advised waiting until after September 3.

8. **Nominations to Committees—Professor Ishman**

Professor Ishman stated that in addition to the list of standing committees within the Graduate Council there are university committees that request representation by the Graduate Council. The following are nominations for those committee positions that need to be voted on and approved by the Graduate Council:

1) Honorary Committee of Distinguished Civil Service Award nominates Matthew Whiles
2) Affirmative Action Advisory Committee nominates John Dobbins
3) University Joint Benefits Committee nominates Judy Huggenvik
4) Traffic and Parking Committee nominates Manoj Mohanty
5) Library Affairs Advisory Committee nominates Matthew McCarroll

Motion to approve the committee nominations was seconded. There being no further discussions, the motion was approved unanimously.

9. **GPSC Report—Shauna MacDonald**

Shauna MacDonald reported that the GPSC has not yet for the semester. The GPSC has been working to increase their representation in various departments on campus by creating a Facebook group, new brochures, sending emails to departments and spending time at the orientation activities in Lawson. In addition to the first meeting on September 7, the GPSC will be working on talking with graduate students about their issues.

10. **Provost Search Committee—Professor Ford**

Professor Ford informed the Council that she is representing the Graduate Council on the Provost’s Search Committee and met with Chancellor Cheng in mid-August to review a large diverse group of applications. She stated that there is an aggressive schedule to bring in candidates in the Fall.
11. **Report of Research Committee—Professor Baer**

Professor Baer stated that the committee plans to meet before the next Graduate Council meeting. She planned to suggest taking a good and hard look at the SIU Comprehensive Evaluation, their Assurances and Advancement Document to at least get the pressing issues related to graduate research that the Graduate Council can address.

Dr. Prudence Rice offered her assistance, if needed, at the Research Committee meetings.

Professor Baer advised any of the council members to contact the Research Committee if they would like assistance with research or development of an opportunity.

12. **Report of New Programs Committee—Professor Hurlburt**

Professor Hurlburt stated that the committee has not met and that the two agenda items are issues from last year. She reminded the Council that they approved the Concentration in Hospitality and Tourism, and it has finally been approved.

Professor Hulburt stated that due to the fact that an original Doctorate in Geology never ceased to exist, the easiest way to get it approved is to request that it be reinstated rather than propose a new program. She sensed that the doctorate program will be reinstated and then the name would change as the program is changed; to Doctorate in Geoscience.

Professor Hulbert is awaiting paperwork on additional proposals to present to the Graduate Council.

13. **Report of Program Review Committee—Professor Kittleson**

Professor Kittleson stated that the committee has not yet met, but anticipates 23 reviews for this year. He recognized the committee members present, and anticipated an additional 16 people who have agreed to participate as designees. He added that Dr. Allen will be contacting those individuals and will have training in early or late September.

Professor Kittleson informed the council that Dr. Allen plans a big push to have an assessment piece in these reviews that really has not existed. He added that everyone does their work quickly, and hopes to complete the bulk of their work between October 1 and Thanksgiving.

Professor Kittleson reported that there is a new protocol for the reviews. Copies of the Program Review Overview were provided to the Graduate Council members to facilitate further discussion.

The Chair interjected that the Resolution comes from the committee therefore no second is needed before the Graduate Council votes.

After a brief discussion regarding the history of the review protocol, it was explained that the new program review protocol started when Dr. Jim Allen was given the job of organizing and rewriting the process to ensure better results and to come up with improved programs for the university. Based on the reviews completed last year, there had been a variety of how these were reported. He hoped that this would be a guideline or stepping stone. Also, that some of this was based on Graduate Council recommendations going back to when Dr. Turley was involved in the Graduate Council, where he put together a very thorough report on how to better not only do reviews but to look at how results are implemented. It was added that Dean Vaux was also involved in similar efforts several years ago.
The second paragraph of the PURPOSE section of the Program Review Overview was addressed:

“Clearly, for all degree programs, these two components are linked: assessment data are critical to identifying what actions to take to improve teaching and learning; without them, the review process is incomplete. Consequently, all program reviews, where appropriate, must attend to student learning—...”

Ryan Netzley suggested removal of the phrasing “where appropriate” or “the review process is incomplete.”, otherwise we have said that it is incomplete and does not matter.

Dr. Ford commented that the “where appropriate” was possibly inserted where it points back to the double asterisk where it points out units that have no teaching role in the assessment on student learning. So, maybe the best solution is to take out the word “appropriate” and put the two asterisks in there as well, and then the footnote refers to that one as well as the earlier one. She gave examples of units with no teaching components, such as the Coal Research Center, Wildlife and Fisheries, and the Center for Archeological Investigations. There are a number of research units on campus that do not have a direct teaching component, although they may have staff that teaches through other units.

Professor Kittleson confirmed that the text read as follows:

“Consequently, all program reviews must attend to student learning**...”

The Chancellor stated that she would argue that that may have been the intent, but if there are students that are engaged in research, we should be expecting that there is some learning going on as well. She suggested a different way of reporting perhaps.

In response to a question regarding the criteria for graduate student involvement in the Program Review Process, Professor Kittleson explained that last year Nicholas Hoffman had been assigned to review a program, but he was corrected and told that graduate students must have graduate faculty status to be assigned to be part of the review program.

Dr. Wilson stated that they are voting members of the council and they can serve on those committees. The Chair confirmed that Nicholas Hoffman is a full representative of the Graduate Council.

Professor Kittleson stated he will check and report back since he also has Nicholas Hoffman and two additional individuals wishing to be involved. He stated that the committee has tried to avoid obvious conflicts of interest or where there is a growth impact on programs within your own college. Everyone has agreed that there is no conflict of interest on any issues.

The Chair concluded by stating that there is a Resolution, with a friendly addition to edit the 2nd paragraph of the PURPOSE.

Dr. Koropchak stated that there is another procedural change that is being negotiated but is not shown in the review process, pertaining to how the report is prepared by the dean. When graduate programs are involved, the traditional way is that the deans of the college and graduate school have co-written these reports and found to be cumbersome when reviewing 23 reports. The deans will prepare their reports and the Provost and Dr. Koropchak will then prepare the response.
Dr. Koropchak confirmed the question by Dr. Kittleson, that the dean of the unit will forward the copy to both he and the Provost.

It was Resolved that the Resolution be accepted. The Resolution was accepted unanimously.


Professor Ford stated that the committee has not yet met. She stated the committee plans to take up the University Code of Conduct and Ethics and to direct any questions on this matter to the committee.

15. **Old Business:**

Dr. Ford stated that the Academic Committee makes recommendations about future calendars to the Provost and had been asked to solicit a show of hands on the controversial issue to the Graduate Council. She presented the issue of going back to the previous calendar where the students have an entire week off in October and then Thursday and Friday off for Thanksgiving. She stated that while there is no hard data, arguments are coming from the mental health experts in the Wellness Center that students need a break. She added that the other argument is if the students are allowed to go home in October they are also going to want to go for Thanksgiving.

The Academic Committee received varied comments and opinions from the Graduate Council members.

16. **New Business:**

The Chair stated that there are no rooms available for the typical April meeting. She asked for opinion of the committee members on moving it to the April 14.

After further discussions, it was agreed to keep the meeting date of April 7 and continue to search for an alternate location.

In response to a question concerning graduate student submission fees, Dr. Sinha stated that ProQuest notified them that students are no longer required to pay the dissertation submission fees. However, students must pay the $25 library fee and the copyright fee which is optional. She added that it will start September 27, so students submitting before that date will pay a fee.

There being no further business to bring before the council, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 9:39 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina M. Price
Recording Secretary

Attachments:
Program Review Overview
Drafts of 8/10/09 Southern Illinois University Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics