

Minutes of the Graduate Council
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
November 4, 2010

Members and Administrative Officers:

Present: Amer AbuGhazaleh, Gary Apgar, Sara Baer, Rita Cheng, Judith Davie, Susan Ford (Ulrich Reichard), Claudette Henderson (GPSC), Nicholas Hoffman (GPSC), Jody Huggenvik, Holly Hurlburt, Scott Ishman, Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, Mark Kittleson, John A. Koropchak, Shauna MacDonald (GPSC), Matthew McCaroll, Paul McGreal, Jay Means, Eileen Meehan (Ryan Netzley), Manoj Mohanty, Nancy Mundschenk (Sharon Shrock), Ryan Netzley, Elyse Pineau, Don Rice, Ratna Sinha, Keith Waugh, Matthew Whiles, David Wilson, Tomasz Wiltowski (Manoj Mohanty) and Bryan Young.

Absent: Najjar Abdul-Musawwir, David Carlson, John Dobbins, Michelle Hook Dewey (GPSC), Leslie Lloyd, John Mead, Joe Moore (GPSC), Mark Peterson, Prudence Rice, and Pamela Smoot.

In Attendance: Larry Schilling, Director of Institutional Research and Tina M. Price, Recording Secretary

Proceedings:

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

Announcement of Proxies:

Dr. Wilson announced the following proxies: Sharon Schrock for Professor Mundschenk, Chair; Professor Reichard for Susan Ford; and Professor Mohanty for Tomasz Wiltowski.

1. **Consideration of Minutes of the October 7, 2010 Graduate Council Meeting.**

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes. The Motion passed unanimously.

2. **Remarks—Chancellor Rita Cheng**

Chancellor Cheng stated that the tour to research areas across the campus is ongoing. Additionally, she received news that the Geology PhD degree has been reactivated and is very pleased with the progress the university is making at the doctoral level.

Chancellor Cheng made the following announcements:

- A new report has come out from the APLU entitled Ensuring Research Universities Remain Vital and will be circulated on the listserv by Dr. Koropchak's office. The report focuses on the pipeline issue, insuring there are more college graduates at the baccalaureate level education so there is a pipeline to graduate education. It also speaks of state and federal funding policies and how in particular they have affected research universities.
- The Chancellor and Dr. Wilson attended a state meeting last week focusing on graduate education at the state level. There were several people from Washington in attendance. The state meeting was an opportunity to talk about SIU, our unique challenges to contribute to the

state of Illinois and the nation in graduate education. The discussions included, specifically, time to degree, issues regarding funding for graduate students, but most importantly that faculty is key [sic] to graduate education. The Chancellor stated that if state funding is eroding, then that erodes graduate as well as undergraduate education.

- The Chancellor will be taking a trip to Taiwan for four very intense days. The trip is fully funded by the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office (TECO) in Chicago, Illinois. They were very concerned about our longstanding relationship with five institutions in Taiwan, but also recently over the softness [sic] in those numbers. Additionally, with the loss of Max Yen as the key contact, the universities are questioning our commitment to undergraduate and graduate students from Taiwan.

The Chancellor stated that the TECO offices have put together an itinerary during which she will meet with all five Taiwan presidents and hopes to return with good news. She added that other faculty and administrators will be doing similar activities over the next year in other countries, and that we are determined to get our international numbers back to their historical strength because it is critical to both graduate and undergraduate enrollment goals.

- The Chancellor asked for as much feedback as possible on the Overload Policy, which is on the agenda today. From her perspective, the feedback will allow for as much flexibility as possible, and the ability to provide adequate compensation for faculty and staff who are going to be doing additional work on the campus.
- The Chancellor met in Edwardsville with Don Severs and his staff from IBHE regarding our 2012 capital budget request. They expressed that 2012 will be a very difficult year.

The Chancellor stated that their conversations were focused on starting a conversation with the new legislature beginning in January:

- i. About the need for more college graduates in the state,
 - ii. The unique role SIUC has in providing access and opportunity for people from all walks of life, and
 - iii. If Illinois is going to have more college graduates, then they are not going to get it from the elite suburban white population in Illinois. So, they need to look at the diversity in this campus and champion it and provide support.
- The first unpaid closure day will be November 23, and that letter went out November 3. The Chancellor advised that it may be a partial closure if they are unable to come to terms with all the bargaining units. She stated that it is not the first choice of strategy, but is a strategy to balance the budget this year.
 - The Chancellor's Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (CPBAC) will convene the week of November 15 and will look at long term solutions for the budget, i.e., revenue sources, as well as efficiencies and operations.
 - A Chancellor's Town Hall Meeting will be convened later this month to go over the issues that are important to the university and seek ideas or strategies on long term ways to be the strongest and most vibrant institution, and also clarify some of the budget pressures.

- The Chancellor announced that Dr. Larry Schilling, Director of Institutional Research, was in attendance to provide a brief discussion of the informational packets which were distributed to the Graduate Council members. The discussion covered key information about the campus and an interpretation of the data.

Dr. Schilling reported that the information was pooled from the databases of human resources, accounting and student information, and melded together into reports that were sent to the state and federal government. One of the major federal government reports is the Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS). These are mandatory reports that are part of the National Institute of Educational Statistics, which is part of the Department of Education; every institution in the country must submit, and they have very distinct definitions on every packet. Dr. Schilling provided a succinct interpretation of the following reports and charts available on the Graduate School website (http://www.gradschool.siu.edu/council/charts_11-4-10.htm):

- i. Presentation by Dr. Kumar at the Faculty Senate:
 - a. Chart: *Changes in Faculty and Non-Faculty at SIU*
 - b. Chart: *Student / Faculty Ratio*
- ii. 2009 Data Presentation
 - a. Chart: *Carbondale Staffing Trends*, which includes all full- and part-time faculty (tenured and non-tenured), A/P and Civil Service; shows *Tuition and Fees* together; shows distribution of *Tuition and Fees* separated; and shows historic *Student / Teacher Ratio*
 - b. Chart: Shows *Expenses* as a part of the core expenses going towards instruction
 - c. On the back page are detailed data broken down into the School of Medicine, Carbondale Campus and Springfield and the total of all three, which can also be found in the SIU Fact Book and on the *Quick Facts Page* on the website.
- iii. 1963 to Current Enrollment History
- iv. A Production History: Credit Hour Views and Comparisons
 - a. Chart: *Total Number of Credit Hours by Grad and Undergrad, and Enrollment*; shows *NIU* and *ISU* comparisons
 - b. Chart: *Undergraduate* alone
 - c. Chart: *Champaign* and *U of I*, *Chicago* and *Edwardsville* comparisons
 - d. Chart: *Credit Hours*
 - e. Chart: *Graduate* alone
 - f. Chart: *History of Student / Faculty Ratio*

The Chancellor commented that this information is being circulated to the Graduate Council and Senate to get quoted and auditable information out, so that any debates can focus on policy. She asked that the CPBAC get engaged and help with coding strategies, so that when the IPEDS survey is presented to the public, we are showing a strong and vibrant university. She stated that one of the major solutions and the denominator for this campus is student enrollment. And as we get our enrollment we get a source of funding and also get our ratios in line with other institutions. Additional information will be presented throughout the year.

The Chancellor stated that she was particularly interested when the Executive Council of the committee meets as to what we would like to do to really focus on graduate education. She encouraged the Graduate Council members to read the APLU document, stating that our peers

across the country are also trying to figure out how we get the state government's attention about how the erosion of state support is affecting us all.

Dr. Schilling briefly discussed the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, stating that it is a standard report introduced by IBHE. He stated that the website has data that can be produced going back to 1978 via a .pdf. He commented that a new peer group list was developed by IBHE and was utilized for the feedback report. The categories are similar but the factored ratios were not included.

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

Interim Provost Rice reported attending a group meeting to discuss a potential joint Indonesia venture which would have their students coming here for one-year's training and then further training to be conducted in Indonesia. Boeing has indicated that they have a contractual agreement with the Indonesians which may require about 600,000 aviation trained individuals over the next two decades. He stated that invitations have been extended to the transportation attaché, general counsel out of Chicago and the transportation minister from Indonesia to look at the facility relatively soon and talk about the possibilities.

Interim Provost Rice reported that the new ambassador to the United States is going to be at a luncheon in St. Louis, Mo, November 29, and either he or the Chancellor will attend that meeting with invitations to do so from Senator Christopher Bond. He stated that it looks like an opportunity that has real promise.

Interim Provost Rice reported that the university did join LSU's Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) project, and that the college portrait is now posted and accessible via the APLU website (<http://www.aplu.org/netcommunity/>). He stated it as a truth-in-advertising program where the participating universities put their data up so that the parents and students can make initial comparative shopping on exactly what things cost and what things are there. Also, data was submitted for the APLU financial survey. Those participants answer survey questions on our budget information relative to the constraints, whether from the state or federal government. Some of those data will be reported in Dallas next week, after which we will receive a comparative report. The whole idea is not to reinvent the wheel if everybody is facing similar problems, and it should be helpful.

4. **Announcements**

Vice Chancellor for Research John A. Koropchak

Dr. Koropchak report that, as of the end of October 2010, external award data are over \$38 Million. We were a little over \$37 Million the same time last fiscal year.

A plaque that was presented to Dr. Willis Swartz, the first dean of the Graduate School, was circulated. As announced at the last Graduate Council meeting, Dr. Juh Wah Chen and Han Lin Chen led an effort to solicit support from students from the late 1950s to 1960s to establish an endowment that will support incoming graduate students in honor of Dr. Swartz. A proposed resolution was circulated to the Graduate Council members. Dr. Koropchak read the resolution.

Reading of the Resolution

Chinese Students 1950s-1960s and Han Lin and Juh Wah Chen

“Whereas, Willis G. Swartz served as the first Dean of the Graduate School at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC), and

Whereas, an endowment in honor of Dr. Swartz has been established in 2010 with the goal of providing support for incoming graduate students, and

Whereas, the concept for this endowment was initiated based on the support of Chinese students from the late 1950s to the mid 1960s at SIUC, and

Whereas, Han Lin Chen and Dr. Juh Wah Chen led the effort to initiate and organize this group to establish this endowment that is sure to provide valuable support to many graduate students at SIUC in the future,

Be it resolved the Graduate Council extends sincere gratitude to the Chinese students from the late 1950s to the mid 1960s at SIUC for their support of graduate education at SIUC, and

Be it further resolved that the Graduate Council of SIUC expresses great appreciation to Han Lin and Juh Wah Chen for their invaluable efforts for establishing this fund.”

If the graduate council does approve this resolution, in an appropriate time we are planning a collaboration with the SIU Foundation and events that would relate to the first awardees of the endowment that now stands at \$50,000. We are putting together a committee that will conduct an evaluation of incoming students to provide some awards for next fall. We will have an awards ceremony and perhaps have the Chen’s and some of these Chinese students back to recognize them as well for their efforts in this regard.

The floor was opened for any thoughts or suggestions for the resolution.

Chancellor Cheng commented that in her conversations with TECO in Chicago, who is funding the trip to Taiwan, the historical significance of SIU to Taiwan and our partnership with institutions there is highly recognized and valued; and Juh Wah Chen is key [sic] to that. He obviously has college mates from Taiwan whom he connects with; we have alums now that are in leadership positions in universities there. She noted that this fund is extending to Chinese students from mainland China as well, so it has been very gracious and open on the part of Juh Wah and his wife.

Dr. Koropchak stated that the fund gives preference to international students and it is not limited to that, and gives preference to international students studying Materials Technology.

Motion to suspend the rules was seconded and approved. There being no further discussion the motion was approved unanimously. A motion to restore the rules was seconded and approved.

Dr. Koropchak reported that the College of Engineering students have scheduled the SIUIS Conference for Friday, November 5 at 3:30 pm in the Student Center Auditorium and Saturday, November 6 at 10:00 am in the Engineering Building. He encouraged the members to take the opportunity to get involved.

The conference brings prominent industrial businesses to the campus, allowing our students to connect and work with them, and create jobs as well as research opportunities. Chancellor Cheng commented that there will be a dinner and Dan Korte, formerly with Boeing and now heading the Rolls Royce defense division, will speak Friday afternoon. Dr. Koropchak added that from a research perspective Mr. Korte helped rejuvenate the connection with Boeing which resulted in one six figure grant to a faculty member at the university. And now that he has moved to Rolls Royce, he is planning to extend that kind of support, as well. A lot of industrial support has been facilitated by Mr. Korte, as well as others like him.

Associate Dean David L. Wilson

Dr. Wilson reported that at the Illinois Association of Graduate Schools meeting there were discussions of the graduate schools in Illinois trying to get together in a concerted effort to explain to the legislature and general public the value of graduate education to the state. With the help of Dr. Harry Berman who is now the Provost at the University of Illinois-Springfield, we attempted to do this several years ago by developing a proposal, but it ran aground due to fears about one major institution's legislative liaisons. That has since changed and something that we will be discussing because, in the first place, we need to figure out how to gather the appropriate data. It has to be data-driven. States like Florida, Virginia and Alabama have all done this. Although Florida is in severe economic constraints when they did this about six or seven years ago, the state gave them over \$200 Million in fellowships based on this. So, it can get a response if it is handled properly, and we will be talking more about that in the future.

It was announced that Alison Hantak in the Department of Physiology won the Outstanding Thesis Award. Her research entitled *Gensenosides Enhance the Cytotoxicity of TNF- α in Human MDA-MB-231 and MCF-7 Breast Cancer Cells in a Caspase-Dependent Manner* shows that there is a synergistic effect with individuals who are taking both dual forms of treatment. The thesis has been submitted to the Midwest Association of Graduate Schools for consideration of the Outstanding Thesis Award.

5. **Faculty Senate—Professor Gary Apgar**

No report.

6. **Report from CPBAC—Professor Ishman**

Professor Ishman reported that the committee finalized the rules and those were then presented to the Deans Council. Other discussions in that committee included an incentive based tuition models related to distance learning overload policy. The overload policy evolved from some of that discussion, and there were further discussions of the budget.

7. **GPSC Report- Shauna MacDonald**

Shauna MacDonald reported that the Philosophy Department will have another Building Bridges Conference this weekend. It is student driven. The guest speaker is Professor Owen Flanagan, an interdisciplinary speaker who studies philosophy, biology and the sciences.

The GPSC also helped sponsor the lecture at the museum and are now preparing for the hearing of pre-proposals.

8. **Report of Research Committee—Professor Baer**

Professor Baer reported that information is being gathered on the ranks beyond full professorship. There are some overlaps with the list of peer institutions, but the list was expanded using the National Science Foundation's ranking of institutions by research and development expenditures. There are a variety of universities and data to be tabulated for further discussions, and they are continuing discussions on what we consider to be much more complex issues.

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

Professor Hurlburt reported on the topic of the Geology PhD. What will happen from the Graduate Council's perspective is that we will get a RME to deliberate on. Dr. Wilson stated that it will go up to the President's office where it is approved and then IBHE is provided notification. So, it is a real quick way to get this degree established.

The Resolution for the Ph.D. Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice was read by Professor Hurlburt:

Reading of the Resolution

Graduate Council Resolution in Support of the Proposed Ph.D. Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice.

“Whereas the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice has proposed adding a Ph.D. program;

and whereas their proposal makes manifest the rapidly rising demand for qualified university professors in Criminology nationwide, and documents a lack of doctoral programs to train said professors. Such a program is in especially high demand in Illinois, whose population is served only by the existing Ph.D. in Criminology at the University of Illinois Chicago. Students trained in the proposed program would be capable of filling not only professorial positions, but also research and intelligence positions within agencies of the criminal justice system;

and whereas the addition of a doctoral program will benefit the department and university. It will raise the research profile of the existing program and aid in retention and future recruitment of young faculty. It will benefit the university as a whole with its interdisciplinary nature and high potential for student recruitment as the department anticipates enrollment of up to 14 new students in its first three years, with further growth thereafter. The strength of faculty in the areas of race, gender and criminal justice further suggest that the program may be attractive to women and minorities;

and whereas all the necessary courses and faculty are already in place, and the proposed addition requires no immediate new expenditures.”

Professor Hurlburt stated that the committee was impressed with the seriousness of the material. The only issues that raised red flags were the usual, will IBHE be friendly with the proposals from the program. She stated it seems to be a program that will obviously bring in students and not cost anything upfront. That being the case, the Program Committee is very much in favor of this proposal.

The floor was opened to questions and discussions.

Professor Leonard asked that the text “and Criminal Justice” be included in the title. She provided a brief discussion regarding the background of the proposal, the growth in doctoral programs and the need for PhDs.

In response to questions regarding the program, Professor Leonard emphasized that the PhD program will increase the department’s competitiveness for external support. The department is very research active, and students completing their Master’s can continue. Another factor is that this campus has a well-rounded social science program, and the plan is to draw from other departments. Additionally, there would be no requirement for new courses.

The only detriment to the department will be a slight decline in funding of Master’s students. It is hoped that the TA positions will move over to the doctoral. In terms of credit hours, we do not have any opportunity for teaching assistants to teach individually. We will offer a little more in undergraduate education and possibly free up some time for faculty research and a few more strategic graduate classes. We were pretty strategic in terms of looking at the credit hours, which total 83.

Professor Leonard clarified that two courses were added.

In response to questions regarding student enrollment, Professor Leonard stated that there are 25 Master’s students in the department and anticipates that it will improve the quality of the students. The department’s retention problem is at the Master’s level as many people get jobs before they complete their thesis. Last year the department approved a non-thesis option in hopes of getting more people to graduation, and we anticipate a two-tier type of track. This year we are developing a plan for an Executive Master’s program that will be primarily distance education to help people who are in incremental positions around the state and other places. In response to a question regarding a total of 83 credit hours, she stated that the Master’s is 33 credit hours.

In response to a question regarding text in the 2nd paragraph, “...aid in retention...”, Professor Hurlburt stated that one of the things that became apparent in Criminology and Criminal Justice programs across the country is that they are losing younger faculty members to universities that have a PhD program because they want to be involved.

Professor Leonard responded that everyone in the faculty is active in research and they do so much mentoring of the Master’s students. It is felt we put our Master’s students through more hoops than other universities. We spend a lot of time serving other doctoral students, but not our own. This program was one of the first criminal justice programs in the country, established in the early 60’s. Now this is the only program that does not have a doctoral.

Dr. Koropchak addressed the faculty turnover within the department, asking if there is a sense among the current faculty that the promise of the program will keep them from straying. Professor Leonard stated that there is no program at this time, but always felt good about people who leave and go to better places. Last year we lost someone who went to the No. 3 program and this year will lose someone to go to the No. 1 program. While we have some success in launching counter-measures, it is hard to keep somebody when we do not have an RME, and that this may go on for years. With her experience in developing two doctoral

programs, she stated that it is fun to be on the ground floor and shape the program into something that you want, and all the people that have recruited have been with the understanding that we are pursuing a doctoral program. So, if we do not get it there may be mass exodus, but if we do get it, then we have passed this step and that is all we can do.

At the conclusion of the questioning period, the Vice Chair stated that the Graduate Council will vote on the resolution at the next meeting per the rules.

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

Professor Kittleson reported that the committee is involved with 23 different reviews. The committee will be meeting with the external people who will be staggered throughout the next few months. The Graduate Council members or representatives will be asked to write a three-point page report. He asked members to thank those who agreed to do this job. It has made the committee's job much easier.

11. **Report of Education Policies Committee—Professor Netzley**

Professor Netzley reported that two resolutions passed out of the committee with a unanimous vote; Draft University Code of Conduct and Draft University Code of Ethics

The floor was opened for any comments or concerns. After a brief discussion, it was noted that concerns regarding each resolution was detailed within the documents. Motion to suspend the rules was seconded and approved.

Reading of a Portion of the First Resolution

Draft University Code of Conduct

“Be it resolved that, in light of our concerns and lack of information, the Graduate Council does not support or endorse this draft *University Code of Conduct* in its current form.”

There being no further discussion a motion to approve was passed unanimously.

Reading of a Portion of the Second Resolution

Draft University Code of Ethics

“Be it resolved that, in light of our very serious concerns with the language and meaning in the document and lack of information on its source or intended use, the Graduate Council does not support or endorse this draft *University Code of Ethics* in its current form.”

There being no further discussion a motion to approve was passed unanimously.

A motion to restore the rules was seconded and approved.

12. **Old Business:**

Dr. Koropchak reported that the Office of Research Development and Administration recently underwent an internal audit. He has received a draft of the audit and expects the full report shortly.

Some of the comments from the audit committee related to hang-ups in the updating of our compliance policies. A report will be provided when the final document comes in.

13. **New Business:**

The Vice Chair stated that the Graduate Council will be looking at a revision of the Graduate School Operating Papers. The Education Policy Committee was tasked with taking the initial look at that and then the other committees within the Graduate Council will then participate at whatever level the Education Policy Committee sees fit. So they will basically be dividing up the work based on the different parts of the Operating Paper.

In response to Dr. Kittleson's question as to whether the faculty and respective colleges are to look at it and comment, Professor Netzley stated that would be fine, but to send the comments to Professor Ford. Dr. Wilson stated that the changes are long overdue and that no changes have been made to reflect the creation of the Chancellor of Research/Graduate Dean position and that is one of the primary things that need to be addressed and other possibilities as well. It was also commented that according to the Operating Paper, the Research Committee has no standing duty.

The Vice Chair encouraged all members to look at it and forward any comments to Professor Ford.

The Vice Chair opened the floor for discussion of the SIUC Overload Policy. The following are summations of the question and answer discussions:

i. Page 1, Item 3.b. What are "credit-free instructional activities?"

This could include Continuing Education, where there are workshops on campus that are not credit bearing. In response to an example presented where faculty supervises graduate students who are not getting credit, it could be part of service, part of overload. This is intended to give flexibility. The layer of administration that is necessary to provide overload was to run everything through Continuing Education and that is very inefficient for the institution and also has some constraints on the faculty and dean's ability to have a conversation about what is good for the program. The previous example could be if you were maxed out of all your other activities, and then it would be decided with departmental approval and the oversight of the dean and provost.

ii. Page 2, Item No. 6. Should the two overload credit courses be during the academic year and allow summers a little bit more flexibility? If this is just for the academic year, then is summer open for additional opportunities?

Summers are not considered overload. It would be outside of the nine-month contract. It goes back to the Page 1, Item No. 2.b.; there is a cap of 20% of the employee's annualized salary. Item No. 6, "No person shall be assigned more than two overload credit courses per fiscal year." is a carryover from the language that was used to inform this one; the Edwardsville policy. It was intended to be within the contract. You can make up to three months in the summer under certain guidelines, and that's not overload, that is summer support.

Overload requests are approved by the Provost's office. To the degree that overload requests are seen now, the requests originate in the schools and come to the Provost's office usually through the Dean, with the Dean's endorsement or his request to clarify whether

this is overload or not. There is intermittent involvement of Continuing Education in terms of compensation.

The Overload Policy Item No. 4 is the sum of the question asked; a mutually agreeable context.

After a short discussion regarding junior faculty research funding and faculty research assignments and funding, the Chancellor stated that these discussions go back to the internal audit findings and the need to get our research policies in order because there are some constraints on overloads from funded sources. She stressed that we have to be careful about the language and practices to make sure they are acceptable to the National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institute for Health Research (NIHR).

- iii. Page 1, Item 2.b. What happens if a faculty member has a course that exceeds the 20%? If they can only be paid for half of what they can earn for this course, where does that money go? Does it go back to the college or to the department? Can it be used for travel? Do we need to clarify whether or not these are state dollars or whether this is coming from cost overrun or cost recovery, such as Continuing Education?

These would not be state dollars. There would be no opportunity to have an overload for state dollars. It would be to generate new tuition, traditional undergraduate/graduate tuition or generate revenue from persons paying for non-credit services, basic cost recovery. There could be service related activities you are asked to do that technically would be coming from our internal tuition pool. You would not be able to, outside of grant generating activity with another agency, be able to generate more state dollars from overload.

There was no answer to the OTS issue other than people who work harder informally and having conversations with their chair and dean by indicating it is not going to be overload but their contribution, and asking for travel money for it.

Interim Provost Rice stated that this is the type of policy that will come out of the discussion of distance learning. Whether or not there is going to be the availability of not only teaching funds, preparation funds for a course, but then perhaps other than salary dollars available depending on the kind of course. In response to whether Item 2.e. answered the question, Dr. Kittleson responded that he interpreted that as if there was travel to be involved with the actual implementation, but concluded that may be what it is taking care of.

- iv. Page 2, Item 3.c. Why is developing distance learning posted outside the normal workload possibility for overload cash and developing courses outside the normal workload not?

Page 1, Item No. 1 indicates that it is over and above services covered. But perhaps Item 3.c. could be broadened to indicate significant work that needs to be done for course development; i.e., distance learning courses.

After a short discussion regarding the renaming of the policy and development of parallel policies for the research side, Interim Provost Rice stated that it is hard enough to get one policy to be reviewed and approved. He stated that going over this and changing and

clarifying the language through the preamble and various details would be a better move to get it done.

The discussion continued with a possible insertion between Item 3.b, 3.c. or 3.a., something to indicate research and activities as well, within the constraints of research policies, because we do not have that. Interim Provost Rice suggested that there could be a set of decision rules up front and then a section on courses, a section on distance education, a section on research where each of those decision rules are clarified; some such mechanism that one document tells you everything you want to know. He stated that when the first document was started, there was already a policy that had been approved by the Board. So, there was not an inclination to reinvent the wheel, although there are differences between Edwardsville and Carbondale, we were certainly aware of that. Summer did not factor into any of the decision making at all. It was not intended to do that. It was intended to create a situation where there would be incentives for people to carry overloads if they wish to do so during the academic semesters of fall and spring, and also better position us for reimbursements for distance learning at a time when we were trying to develop a distance learning policy.

Chancellor Cheng stated that it is really important that anything you do from a research policy committee to incentivize research does not take away or change any of the emphasis here. It basically says we really want to go after new markets and have the flexibility to either within load or overload and compensate faculty appropriately. And if they are maxed out in their research, teaching and service research, we want to be able to, in a flexible manner, offer additional compensation. With that said, a lot of the activity could be within load.

Interim Provost Rice stated that we have a standing guideline that chairs or unit administrators assign workloads. It is not a negotiable issue. We are getting into a little bit of negotiation here. If one chair decides a particular activity really is not worthy of an overload remuneration, then you are going to get a grievance. There will be a lot of grievances coming out of this unless it is very well defined. The definitions are going to come from the contract and the existing board policy that set how the workload is defined and then these are the rules that will be brought into play when talks start about overload.

In response to a question regarding developing ground rules, Chancellor Cheng stated that there must be a conversation about what is overload within the departments. She added that it needs to be monitored very carefully at the dean and provost level to make sure that there is a consistent approach and that we are having that three-pronged approach of instruction, research and service adequately covered.

In response to a question of whether overload compensation dollars must go to that faculty member or can it be used to hire an instructor to teach a course, Chancellor Cheng advised that the chair or dean could have a conversation with about having a course developed and that you are the best person to be able to do that. If you are tapped out, they can easily hire a term faculty member to do that. The whole idea is that we need to generate revenue for this institution. That money, in the distance education models that are coming, could be shared by the departments. You can say no, but there will be money to support travel or support a new graduate student within the departments as a result of this activity. Right now we are shrinking in state support.

Chancellor Cheng stated that what she is hearing is the need to put the word “research” somewhere so that it allows for a research policy to later connect with this policy. Professor Whiles suggested that it is impossible to define when there is an overload with research. He questioned at what point do you decide it is overload? The way to keep this simple is to keep it with teaching and instruction. Chancellor Cheng stated that other universities have research incentive programs that may or may not connect in the sense of overload. They are not in overload policy. Professor Mohanty and the council members had further discussions addressing research overload examples and making comparisons with teaching overloads.

The Vice Chair stated that the discussion be continued over email and to send ideas and recommendations to Nancy Mundschenk, Chair of the Graduate Council, so she can have further discussions before sending these on to the Chancellor by the 15th.

Chancellor Cheng stated upon arriving to the campus and finding that there was no Overload Policy, she felt responsible for bringing this forward. And after hearing about the use of continuing education to get around this and the fact that those credit hours do not show up in any of our performance reports to IBHE, she asked for a fast track on this. She also clarified that she misspoke about the outside funding, because it could clearly be that a colleague gets sick and you are asked to teach an extra class and there is funding that comes in for tuition on that. But there are other circumstances where having that flexibility would allow for fairly compensating.

The Vice Chair advised that the next meeting of the Graduate Council will be Thursday, December 9, 2010. There being no further business to bring before the council, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 9:51 a.m.

Attachments:

Fall 2009 IPEDS Data and Charts from PowerPoint (http://www.gradschool.siuc.edu/council/charts_11-4-10.htm)

Resolution: Chinese Students 1950s-1960s and Han Lin and Juh Wah Chen

Resolution: Ph.D. in Criminology and Criminal Justice

Resolution: University Code of Conduct

Resolution: University Code of Ethics

SIUC Overload Policy

Tina M. Price
Recording Secretary