

Minutes of the Graduate Council  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
April 7, 2011

**Members and Administrative Officers:**

*Present:* Najjar Abdul-Musawwir, Sara Baer, Carl Bloom, David Carlson, Rita Cheng, Judith Davie, John Dobbins (Craig Anz), Susan Ford, Nicholas Hoffman, Jody Huggenvik, Holly Hurlburt, Scott Ishman, Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, John A. Koropchak, Shauna MacDonald (GPSC), Matthew McCarroll, John Mead, Jay Means, Eileen Meehan, Manoj Mohanty (Tomasz Wiltowski), Nancy Mundschenk, Ryan Netzley, Mark Peterson, Elyse Pineau, Joshua Potter (GPSC), Travis Pour (GPSC) (Dennis Lunt), Prudence Rice, Sharon Shrock, Ratna Sinha, Pamela Smoot, Keith Waugh, Matthew Whiles, David Wilson, Tomasz Wiltowski and Bryan Young.

*Absent:* Amer AbuGhazaleh, Leslie Lloyd, and Paul McGreal.

*In Attendance:* Richard Clough and Maureen Duran, Department of Histology and Tina M. Price, Recording Secretary.

**Proceedings:**

Meeting called to order at 8:00 am by Chair Mundschenk in the Basement of Morris Library at located at the SIU Carbondale Campus, Carbondale, Illinois.

**Announcement of Proxies by Associate Dean David Wilson:**

Craig Anz for John Dobbins; Dennis Lunt for Travis Pour (GPSC); and Tomasz Wiltowski for Manoj Mohanty.

1. **Consideration of Minutes**

The Chair noted that the Minutes be corrected to indicated that Sharon Schrock was indeed in attendance. Motion moved by the Chair to accept the Minutes of the March 3, 2011, Meeting of the Graduate Council. Motion carried.

2. **Remarks—Chancellor Rita Cheng**

Agenda items for the Board of Trustees meeting next Tuesday:

- i. Tenure promotion ratification from the Board.
- ii. Tuition and Fees in May. Information will be put forward to the Board, and they will be asked to act on it later this year. An 8.9% tuition increase will be requested, which will generate approximately \$6 Million for the Campus.

Two major areas where we would use the \$6 million:

- i. To close the \$5.7 Million structural deficit at the campus; and
- ii. The balance being used for promotions from Assistant to Associate, and Associate to full, and term faculty to continue across the campus; \$500,000 is need for that.

While 8.9% sounds very high, it is coming off zero percent from last year. So, the average is 4.5%. There will be new members on the Board of Trustees by the time the vote occurs, and hopes are that they will understand the need for a high quality experience for our students.

The items of most interest to the Graduate Council include a research insert that we will have in collaboration with the Southern Illinoisan. Tom Wolf and the staff at the Southern Illinoisan will work with the Dean's across campus, with Dr. Koropchak and his staff, to identify stories that might be of interest to the local community. Watch for them Sunday.

The installation week has been planned since last summer, as a way to have another opportunity to showcase what we do and draw attention to the campus from across the country. Its tradition and it is celebrating the campus as well as a formal installation of the Chancellor at the Friday ceremony. There are rumors that we are spending a lot of money on it; what was identified was luncheon for the delegates on Friday and punch and cookies reception after the installation.

There are a lot of things going on in April; undergraduate research, we inserted more from the Paul Simon Institute's Public Policy lecture series, and Bryan at Shryock organized the circus and the Tokyo String Quartet, which was placed on the flyer for that week.

A task force is being put together to review graduation, to look at the ways we are doing graduation compared to our peers. Do we have more opportunities to expose our undergraduates to our hooding ceremony for PhDs and the traditions of our Master's ceremony? So, we will be looking at studying what we do and asking people to take a closer look and reflect on that as we go forward. The other tradition we hope to put in place is the convocation this fall; for our new students coming onto campus will have that as their first experience; getting ourselves into the higher ranks of public universities and retaining our students.

Enrollment at the undergraduate level is up 4%; admissions up 12%; and 8% on housing contracts. This is because we have doubled the efforts throughout. We will be watching these very carefully. The other part of enrollment is continuing students. So anything that can be done to encourage undergraduates that you do teach, particularly at the junior/senior level to register for fall and not go home in the summer, because that is the highest risk that we have; students who have not made a commitment.

### 3. Announcements

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

- Grants and contracts at end of 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter: \$60.6 Million, + 5% versus the same time last year. \$10.3 Million for the month. Rebounded from recent months. Remarkable result considering that stimulus dollars went away. A testament to the excellence of our faculty, staff and students.
- Reminder of events going on next week:
  - i. Undergraduate Research Symposium
  - ii. Proclamation from the City of Carbondale
  - iii. Outstanding Scholar Lecture on Tuesday at noon
  - iv. RTM Tuesday afternoon, including poster awards.
- Jim Allen now handling new program requests for the Provost's Office; a welcome improvement.
- Recently received our 5<sup>th</sup> patent for the fiscal year, already a record for any fiscal year; this one to Dan Dyer, et al.
- Potential shutdown of Federal Agencies: No current knowledge of impact to the campus. We are keeping in close contact with our national organizations for information.
- St. Louis Area Undergraduate Research Symposium (STLAURS) will be back in Carbondale, May 7, 2011.
- John Benshoff received the Distinguished Career Award by National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE)
- Stoure Robertson NCRE's Rehabilitation Educator of the year
- John Warren, a faculty member in Speech Communications, recently passed away. We send our condolences to the family and colleagues of Dr. Warren.

The Chancellor followed up with additional announcements on the Dean and Provost activities:

- COLA Dean Candidates should be on campus in the next few weeks. The Provost staff is working on the details.
- The Engineering Dean Search Committee will meet one more time. They are working hard and hope to have candidates on campus soon.
- The Provost Screening Committee has submitted their report. Candidates on campus the week of March 18-25, with the process completed by May 1<sup>st</sup>.

#### Associate Vice Chancellor Prudence Rice

The Faculty Seed Grant competition has had all their panel meetings. Working on the awards and budgets in the next week.

In connection with research week, on Monday at 1:00 p.m. there will be a lecture by the Assistant Attorney General for the Southeastern U.S. We have worked with the FBI to

arrange this lecture, and it is about the issue of deemed exports and controlled exports. This is a thorny problem and complex issue; discussion of an individual fined and receiving jail time for taking controlled technologies to China. There are enormous lists of what constitutes controlled technologies and deemed exports; refers to things where colleagues from embargoed countries coming into laboratories and seeing some of the research that is being done. Also includes you going to a foreign country and carrying controlled data technology knowledge on your computer or flash drive, even if you were not showing it to anybody. Even if you were just travelling in one of those countries like China or Iran, you could be accused of sending out or transmitting this controlled data.

So, we invited the Assistant US Attorney General to come and talk with the campus about this problem. Those of you in the engineering or sciences or in some of the fields of agriculture, it could be very important. We are hoping that there could be good attendance in those fields.

The Dean's Search Committee for the College of Engineering sent a list of names forward about two weeks ago to the Provost. We have a meeting tomorrow.

The Chancellor interjected, stating that she has seen the COLA Dean list submitted by the Chair. The Chair of the committee should pass that to Susan Logue and Linda Macabe Smith as far as affirmative action.

There were discussions regarding controlled technologies. They include computer software and a lot of it is military weapons.

Dr. Koropchak interjected. In response to that we are in the process of working with Legal Counsel to draft a Deemed Exports Policy.

Dr. Rice added that what most universities are doing is to have a decision tree: are you carrying nuclear weapons, the answer is "yes" or "no?"

Dr. Koropchak added that it can be intellectual property that could be used by businesses.

#### Associate Dean David L. Wilson

Fellowships are all completed and letters are going out tomorrow. So, we have gotten through that process and thank you to all the people participating on those panels.

An issue raised at the Midwest Association of Graduate Schools meeting last week, has to do with the national budgeting and budgets, and could have a significant impact on graduate education. The Department of Education has proposed eliminating of subsidized loans for graduate students. What that means is that they will only be able to borrow from unsubsidized loans, which means that the interest accumulates while they are in school. There are some who fear that when an undergraduate who has a subsidized loan goes to graduate school, that interest will start accruing on their subsidized loan while they are in graduate school. This is going to be a huge problem for all of us.

Graduate students in total have borrowed about \$20 Million this year; about 1,400 students. Not yet known is part of that figure is subsidized and unsubsidized. It is about a million dollars in interest for this campus alone. The estimates are, next year, a loss to graduate students of about \$2 Billion collectively across the country and somewhere around \$12-15 Billion over the next decade.

The national organizations are working very hard to try to derail this. The DOE is pushing the idea as a means of maintaining or increasing Pell Grants. So it is pitting undergraduate against graduate. This is quite a serious issue.

Along with the deemed exports issues, some universities have warned that faculty who are travelling abroad to not take their personal laptops. Or if you do, there are some universities with a pool of laptops with, basically, a blank hard drive you can do your email. That is something that the university should consider for those who travel a lot in Asia; find some mechanism where they can have electronics to keep in touch with home, but are not going to be subject to seizure. If they are seized by Customs when returning to the country, you are not going to have a problem.

#### **Associate Dean John S. Mead**

The National Science Foundation has issued a new RFP for the IGERT Program. This year there is no pre-proposal, but the full proposal is due this summer. We are taking a look at developing one on energy, but there may be other concepts. Universities now can submit only one per institution.

Dr. Koropchak interjected, stating that the benefits of the new campus energy group were the submission of a pre-proposal last year and getting feedback for the next proposal.

#### **Chair Nancy Mundschenk**

There were no announcements to report.

#### 4. **Faculty Senate—Professor Apgar**

The Faculty Senate Executive Group met on Tuesday and submitted two names for the RFP for Management Systems. The Faculty Status Committee plans to meet to go over the suggestions.

#### 5. **Report from CPBAC—Professor Ishman**

The Information Technology Subcommittee presented an executive summary of their findings which included functional recommendations for information technology across the campus. Those were distributed to the council for review.

Dr. Koropchak interjected stating that Kevin Bame, Vice Chancellor for Finance, and his staff, have been working on enhancing the broadband capability for the campus. It has been a challenge due to the fact that there are not a lot of established vendors. There is likely to be a significant increase in the bandwidth within the next three months.

Chancellor Cheng added that the end of the semester is targeted. There are six significant companies that are part of the mix here. It is a significant cost to the campus, but it is a significant need.

6. **GPSC Report- Shauna MacDonald**

There was a brief discussion of amendments voted on at the last meeting of the Graduate Council. It was reported that some of the amendments may have changed, and the bulk of them did not pass.

In terms of structure of the GPSC, it was voted not to meet in the summer because many of the graduate students leave and work in the summer, leaving large holes in the many of the departments and representation on the Council.

A vote was taken on the Tuition and Fee increases and, not surprisingly, we are generally opposed to the tuition increase. More surprisingly, there were votes in favor of many of the increases. The Council members were opposed to increase at the Student Center and the athletics' fee. Nominations for officer positions at the Graduate Council were taken and representatives will be voted on at the next meeting. There is work going on regarding Undergraduate Student Trustee portion of the student elections, which are happening April 19-20; results of that by the next meeting.

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

There was a brief discussion, with no report.

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

A handout showing Sample Award data was distributed to the Graduate Council members.

***Resolution:***

**Academic Activity Incentive Award Resolution**

The concept behind the Resolution has been in discussions for about a year and a half and we have really been exploring ways for the faculty pursuing academic activities means that are really key to the resolution; “over and beyond the expectation of the department and the college.” So, considering that, many of us have a certain percentage of our appointment that is essentially for research, and we need to fulfill that. It is potentially to incentivize faculty to maybe go the extra mile, to reward faculty that are really going “above and beyond” the call of duty. So, this is not an award for bringing in a single grant. So the

reward would provide an additional option for faculty bringing in extra dollars beyond what they would use, say in their three months of summer salary and faculty. Examples of these awards, faculty going above and beyond...in the sciences or engineering...so the option faculty member has when confronted with acquisition of awards when they have requested salary dollars and their salary dollars are being fulfilled...so with many faculty, what do we do with this extra money. First of all, you could hire post-doctorial to help rework the budget to get it approved by the funding agency, a technician or hire some graduate students or buyout your teaching responsibilities. So, this incentive award is different in that it would create another option. That does not necessarily detract from the other options.

So, part of this Resolution benefit is that it proposes some of those salary dollars that came in through those additional awards, that those salary dollars be substituted for the salary dollars that you are paid by the State. So, a certain percentage of your time is allocated to research, so it is substituting those dollars. Those, in essence, are what we are calling the "release dollars" that could go back to the faculty member as an incentive award, and only a portion of those dollars can go back to the faculty member. We are recommending based on some models we were looking at in Auburn and West Virginia that the faculty member could request up to 75% of those dollars back as an incentive award, but no more than 2.5 months--equivalent to 2.5 months of that faculty member's base salary.

The other part of this is that the committee felt strongly that we did not want this to be perceived as only an award that faculty is bringing in for external dollars onto the campus. So, part of the Resolution is to create a university-wide incentive pool. Some of those dollars would go to this university-wide and be used for faculty and less-funded programs just by nature of discipline, which go above and beyond the expectations of their departments and colleges, and that they could apply for a similar kind of an award created through this incentive pool.

Another thing to keep in mind if you are looking at those example budgets is a 3-, 2- and 1-year award, again, over and above the call of duty. These external dollars also bring in more graduate students, potentially more post-doctoral, post-doctoral training. One of those awards has equipment on it, which output that comes from these grants or external funds in the form of presentations, publications, graduate student training, it all contributes in raising the research and academic profile of SIU.

And the other bottom line is it is essentially no cost to the board, no cost to any college and no cost to SIU.

### **Resolution Read by Professor Baer**

**Whereas**, externally funded academic activity (1) enhances the visibility and status of the University in diverse ways, (2) increases enrollment through support for graduate students, (3) provides opportunities to enrich the undergraduate experience, (4) supplies and updates infrastructure for academic and technological advancement (e.g.,

equipment), (5) generates significant revenue for the University through indirect cost returns that support and enhance academic activities across campus; and

**Whereas**, there is no policy to reward faculty for the pursuit and subsequent acquisition of externally funded academic activity that exceeds expectations of the faculty member's department/unit and college, and;

**Whereas**, the absence of an academic incentive policy may serve as disincentive to pursue academic activity that exceeds expectations of the faculty member's department/unit and college, and;

**Whereas**, faculty can be awarded funds for salary through external academic activities;

**Therefore, be it resolved** that when external sponsoring agencies provide to support faculty time and effort, those funds can be used to release state funds dedicated to a faculty member's assignment and used to create or renew a university academic incentive award pool;

**Therefore, be it also resolved** that state funds released from a faculty member's teaching assignment must be used to satisfy that teaching requirement, and funds in excess of fulfilling the requirement also be used to create or renew a university academic incentive award pool;

**Therefore, be it also resolved** that the faculty member whose externally funded activity released state funds be eligible to receive up to 75% of released state funds (not to exceed 2.5 months of the faculty member's base salary) as an academic incentive award, as approved by the Provost; and

**Therefore, be it also resolved** that a portion of the university academic incentive award pool be dedicated to reward unfunded or under-funded faculty whose academic activities exceed department/unit and college expectations through an academic incentive award (not to exceed 2.5 months of the faculty member's base salary), as approved by the Provost.

The Chair opened the floor for questions and comments, which Professor Baer addressed.

- i. Do we have any evidence whether Auburn or West Virginia's grant production increased as a result of this policy? We do not have any documented evidence.
- ii. They have evidence that it works, so how do they see this?



Dr. Koropchak stated that he had conversations with the people at West Virginia who think that productivity per unit per faculty has increased. While cause-and-effect is not something neither easily measured nor separated, the deans involved see activity by their faculty that goes beyond what they normally note. They think it has had a major effect.

- iii. There was announcement earlier that we are already going above and beyond, so what is the problem that we are trying to solve with this particular Resolution?

Dr. Koropchak responded that we are not trying to solve a problem. We are trying to enhance the program of what we are doing as a campus.

- iv. **Whereas** statement No. 3, “Whereas, the absence of an academic incentive policy may serve as disincentive to pursue academic activity...” is a problem statement; this is the problem and we have to solve it. It indicates a problem of [no] incentive in its current form. How is this a problem, and how is this going to solve that problem? The Resolution would provide the following options:
  - a. Incentives to sustain the activities of those faculty members who bring in more, and they are pursuant to these external dollars.
  - b. Incentives to faculty members experiencing burn-out; a way to sustain activity.
  - c. The departments benefit from that very research active person who maintains their productivity and does more, and the university will recognize that in some way.
  - d. The option of bringing in extra work or a post-doctoral to do the work.
- v. How will this be measured? Is there a template for “exceeds expectations?” It will vary by department and the mechanism will have to be discussed within colleges and within departments.

Dr. Koropchak stated that the mechanism starts by getting an agency and grant to pay for part of the salary dollars currently being paid for by the State. So, it is releasing dollars currently used to pay faculty members to be used for other purposes.

- vi. Is this optional or a template that you are trying to establish?

Dr. Koropchak’s response advised the School of Medicine already has this in effect. So, this would just expand the application of that concept to the rest of the campus, which does not have access to that right now.

There were discussions regarding the concept of the pilot program at the School of Medicine, the question of whether the policy is either a morale boost or a productivity boost, and the assumption of how faculty work. In response to these concerns, the Chair’s

suggestion of a friendly amendment to delete the third paragraph of the Resolution was viewed positively.

Further discussions addressed the following:

- A friendly amendment to rename the Resolution to reflect awards to [super achievers or outstanding researchers]
- The benefit of extending a nine-month assignment
- Indirect benefits of the policy and no impact on indirect costs
- The financial impact and use of the funds, e.g. a university pool
- The focus of efforts on research versus teaching responsibilities
- The conflict of supporting additional graduate students versus being about to support yourself in buying out time
- Support and involvement of the departmental chair and dean during negotiations
- The assumption of evaluations being handled at the annual reviews
- Level of consulting that might be involved and/or come back to the university rather than seeking other opportunities at the campus

The Chair advised that the Resolution will be on the agenda next month.

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

Dr. Maureen Duran, and Richard Clough, Department of Histology, were introduced and provided a brief description of the Histotechnology program.

***Vote:***

**RME in Support of a Certificate of Training in Histotechnology**

Reading of the Resolution by Professor Hurlburt

**RATIONALE**

**Whereas**, the School of Medicine has proposed a certificate of training in Histotechnology (the science and practice of biological tissue preparation). The certificate will be offered to both undergraduate and graduate students. The certificate program provides training and preparation for a national exam in Histotechnology, and is in response to a growing demand for trained personnel in several fields of medical research; and

**Whereas**, there are no similar programs in Illinois, and only four baccalaureate programs nationwide. The program fills a regional and national need and may attract additional students to our campus; and

**Whereas**, most of the required curriculum is already on the books, and the program will require no new faculty/staff or facilities.

**RESOLUTION**

**Therefore be it resolved** that the Graduate Council approves the proposed RME for a Certificate of Training in Histotechnology.

**Motion:** Hearing no objections or comments, the Chair entertained a motion to accept the Resolution. The motion was carried.

**Vote:**

**RME in Support of concurrent MD/Masters of Public Health Degree**

Reading of the Resolution by Professor Hurlburt

**RESOLUTION**

**Therefore be it resolved** that the Graduate Council approves the proposed RME for a concurrent MD / MPH Degree.

**Motion:** Hearing no objections or comments, the Chair entertained a motion to accept the Resolution. The motion was carried.

**Vote:**

**RME for Name Change of Women Studies to  
Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies**

**RESOLUTION**

**Therefore be it resolved** that the Graduate Council approves the proposed RME for name change to Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

**Motion:** Hearing no objections or comments, the Chair entertained a motion to accept the Resolution. The motion was carried.

**Resolution:**

Reading of the Resolution by Professor Hurlburt

**RME for Elimination of Ecology Certificate in Plant Biology,  
and  
Creation of a Concentration in Ecology by the same department**

## **RATIONALE**

**Whereas**, the Department of Plant Biology has proposed eliminating the Certificate Program in Ecology due to lack of student interest; and

**Whereas**, the department proposes to replace the above with a new concentration in Ecology within their Ph.D. program; and

**Whereas**, Ecology is a multidisciplinary field, providing the opportunity for interaction and cooperation by students and faculty across departments, programs and colleges. Further, it is a traditional strength at SIUC, as indicated by the success of SIUC's Center for Ecology (which does not grant degrees); and

**Whereas**, the concentration will require only minor programmatic changes, and will not require new faculty or new resources, and is predicted to increase graduate enrollment;

## **RESOLUTION**

**Therefore be it resolved** that the Graduate Council approves the proposed RMEs for the elimination of the Ecology Certificate and the creation of an Ecology Ph.D. concentration in Plant Biology.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion. The following points were made:

- There are a number of departments on campus that are proposing to create these concentrations in ecology, and that the Plant Biology Certificate in Ecology has been underused.
- It gives more recognition to our strength in ecology without creating a new program.
- It is in line with the concentration that is being proposed in Environmental Resources and Policy (ER&P).
- It does not require any resources and only programmatic changes with respect to classes and students
- More collaboration and cooperation across the campus in research and training.

There were no further comments, at which time the Chair advised that the Resolution will be on the May agenda.

### ***Resolution:***

Reading of the Resolution by Professor Hurlburt

**Support of RME for the Creation of a Concentration in Ecology  
by the Environmental Resources and Policy Ph.D. Program**

## **RATIONALE**

**Whereas**, ER&P proposes to create a new concentration in Ecology within their Ph.D. program; and

**Whereas**, Ecology is a multidisciplinary field, providing the opportunity for interaction and cooperation by students and faculty across departments, programs and colleges. Further, it is a traditional strength at SIUC, as indicated by the success of SIUC's Center for Ecology (which does not grant degrees); and

**Whereas**, the concentration will require only minor programmatic changes, and will not require new faculty or new resources, and is predicted to increase graduate enrollment;

## **RESOLUTION**

**Therefore be it resolved** that the Graduate Council approves the proposed RME for the creation of an Ecology Ph.D. concentration in ER&P.

There was a brief discussion regarding combining proposed ecology concentrations under one resolution, and the ongoing discussions of interdisciplinary efforts.

There were no further comments.

### ***Resolution:***

Reading of the Resolution by Professor Hurlburt

Graduate Council Resolution – April, 2011  
in Support of RME for the Creation of a Concentration in Climatology  
by the Environmental Resources and Policy Ph.D. Program

## **RATIONALE**

**Whereas**, ER&P proposes to create a new concentration in Climatology within their Ph.D. program; and

**Whereas**, Climatology is a multidisciplinary field, providing the opportunity for interaction and cooperation by students and faculty across departments, programs and colleges. Further, it is a field that has witnessed tremendous growth in the past decade; and

**Whereas**, the concentration will require only minor programmatic changes, and will not require new faculty or new resources, and is predicted to attract new students, increase graduate enrollment and help in the retention of faculty;

## RESOLUTION

**Therefore be it resolved** that the Graduate Council approves the proposed RME for the creation of a Climatology Ph.D. concentration in ER&P.

ER&P provided a summary with data suggesting that this is an area of growth, there is faculty expertise available, [~50] and many of the courses are being taught. There were no further comments.

### 10. **Report of Program Review Committee—Professor Leonard**

The committee met on Monday, May 4. The new plan for the committee is to come up with recommendations to Dr. Jim Allen, Director of Assessment. A copy of the memo to Dr. Allen, dated April 7, 2011, was distributed to the Council. Under consideration are the roles of the internal and external reviewers, how to streamline the review process into one group, provide some type of synergy in terms of understanding roles, and have recommendations to clarify what the point is of these reviews, with questions to clarify how they should be used. Internal reviewers were invited and include not only the Graduate Council, but reviewers who came from department recommendations. So people who could not come to the meeting gave their input via email.

The committee members are working toward getting more internal reviewers for next year. In the last two years there have been a large number of reviews required because there were a couple of years where they were not being done. The committee has caught up over the last two months. So, instead of being in the 20s and 30s, next year the numbers are expected to be in the 10s.

### 11. **Report of Education Policies Committee—Professor Ford**

The Education Policies Committee was charged with looking at the Operating Paper for review and possible revisions. Thank you to all the area people who offered input. The document has been reviewed by all appropriate committees and discussed at length. The document brought forth has suggested changes, without changing the meaning of that particular segment (See Attachment: The Operating Paper for the Graduate School). The next step will be to go to the Graduate Faculty.

There were a number of corrections, with attention directed to the following during the report to the Graduate Council:

- i. Page 1, Section One, Part I.C.: This change preserves the idea that the Graduate Faculty as representative of the Graduate Council does play an important role in research policy, but that it is not mandated that the Graduate Faculty be subject to every change.

The Chair suggested the Council members refer to the comments that are numbered in the columns; this was SF3.

- ii. Section Two, Part I.A.1.L.: The next comment below SF14. This policy dates back to 2005 and was never brought forward through the entire process. While this does not require further discussion by the Graduate Council, it needs to complete the process of going on to the Graduate Faculty.

Dr. Wilson offered a brief explanation as to the origins of this Emeritus and adjunct faculty segment. It was noted that the underlined segment is verbatim language from the resolution approved by a previous Graduate Council.

- iii. Section Two, Part I.A.2.a.: (SF16) This is an important statement because it states what the Graduate Faculty is empowered to do. Not noted is the recommendation to add a period after “*Trustees*” and the remaining text to be deleted. The resulting statement will still protect the rights of which the Graduate Faculty is empowered.
- iv. Section Two, Part I.B.4.b.xv.-xvi.: (SF19-20) These statements were placed there in the 1960s. Deleting these statements does take away detailed responsibilities of the Graduate Council, so it may require a vote.
- v. Section Two, Part II.A.2.: (SF23-24) This was brought forward to the Graduate Council because the Committee was not unanimous in taking out the latter portion of A.2.

There was a brief discussion after which removing the latter portion was recommended.

- vi. Section Two, Part II.D.: (SF29) The recommended change is more in keeping with the practices of the Graduate Council.

The Education Policies Committee members were thanked for the work done through this long process.

The Chair stated that this will go out to the full Graduate Faculty for 30 days, and then there will be a vote.

12. **Old Business:**

No Report.

13. **New Business:**

David Carlson, Dean of Library Affairs, made a 20-minute formal presentation discussing Morris Library’s move from print to digital. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation may be viewed on the Graduate School website.

***Adjournment:*** There being no further business to bring before the council, the motion to adjourn was moved by the Chair and seconded. May 5, 2011, and the Missouri and Kaskaskia Rooms of the Student Center were fixed as the time and place of the next regular meeting, and the April 7, 2011 meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Attachments:

Academic Incentive Award and Handout of Award Samples  
RME Creation of Ecology PhD Concentration in ER &P  
RME Creation of Climatology PhD Concentration in ER&P  
RME Elimination of Ecology Certificate in Plant Biology and  
Creation of Ecology PhD Concentration in Plant Biology  
Memo to Dr. Allen, dated April 7, 2011  
Graduate School Operating Paper levels 1 2 comments

Tina M. Price  
Recording Secretary