

2018-2019 Graduate Council

Meeting Minutes

DEC 6th, 2018

Members Present: Randolph Burnside, Wesley Calvert, Saran Donahoo, Buffy Ellsworth, Themistoklis Haniotakis, Henry Hexmoor, Karen Jones, Sajal Lahiri, Junghwa Lee, Marc Morris, Julie Partridge, Sophia Ran, Sue Rimmer, Emily Vajjala, Jennifer Lynn Smith, Rachael Steiger, Tomás Velasco, Rachel Whaley.

Members Absent: Ruopu Li, Trish McCubbin, Terry Clark,

Proxies: Clay Awsumb for Jordan Maddox, Benton Hendrickson for Derrik McDowell, Dianah McGrehan for Jarneika Taylor, John Warwick for Terry Clark.

Ex-Officio: Guests: Lizette Chevalier, James Garvey, James Wall, Juliane Wallace.

Guests: Prema Narayan, Ruth Ann Rehfeldt, Phil Jensik

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:01 AM.

- **Consideration of the minutes of the previous meeting**

Partridge- 1st

Ellsworth- 2nd

In Favor-17
Against-0
Abstain-0

MOTION PASSES

Chevalier- We have been taking a look at the issue of cross listing 400 and 500 level courses. The issue that I saw coming out of my office was with 500 level courses that had the pre reqs of 200 and 300 level courses. That to me raised a red flag, so we are working with the deans, banner does not require that these cross listed courses have the same pre reqs as the cross listed 400. In addition, the graduate catalogue does not really list pre reqs for undergraduate courses, so were working with deans to try and get these cross listed 500 classes instead have graduate standing/permission of instructor. This is still underway, I am working with the grad school as well as the deans to try to look at that issue. Be trying to encourage students to register before heading home for winter break. In terms of export control, Tom Wakeland following the BOT policy, the use of a clean lap top for research conferences travel to China, Cuba, Iran, Sudan, Syria, North Korea, and the Ukraine and possibly Russia, so this has been implemented. There

are interviews ongoing for the director of undergraduate admissions. With our upcoming BOT meeting there will be no tuition or fee increases being requested for Fall 2019.

Also, at the BOT meeting the Provost will be making a presentation on reorg. What we found out with our first major discussion with IBHE, when the Chancellor was still with us, what they wanted us to do was to have an overall presentation to the board, so they knew about reorg, and their approval of us using this as an RME as opposed to a NUI. We aren't creating a new school such as a School of Pharmacy, a new area, we're simply doing administrative reorganization so hence the RME should follow. In terms of the Interim Chancellor search, we're expecting an announcement on the person or the process at the next BOT meeting. The last item for the Higher Learning Commission, our campus review will be in Spring 2020, and we will be making presentations to inform the larger community about what's occurring with HLC, what progress we are making, and things that we have identified that we need to work on as a campus. That ends my remarks there.

Donahoo- Chairs were given one semester contracts this year. What's going on for the Spring?

Chevalier- I really don't know that answer. In terms of the College of Education and Human Services, the Ed.D has gone forward to IBHE last week, finally.

Lahiri- What is Ed.D?

Chevalier- Saran?

Donahoo- It's a Doctorate of Education, so it's more of a practice based doctorate instead of research based.

Lahiri-In terms of Interim Chancellor, I think it would be good for us to know who the short list candidates are and for the board to have some feedback from us. I think that we were told that we would not be given a short list, and that would be really unacceptable.

Chevalier- I can pass that on.

Jones- Do you know what date and time grades are due? It would be nice to send a reminder.

Chevalier- I don't know at this time, yes.

Rimmer- On the reorganization, there is still a lot of concern in the college about a dissolution. A lot of faculty, where they might be in favor of the schools and the formation of schools, there's a lot of hesitancy of the reorganization because of the colleges they may be reporting to. Has there been any discussion or thoughts of maybe not dissolving the College of Science?

Chevalier- I know that the financial sustainability plan of the BOT is expecting the reduction of a college. In terms of the college structure and what that will be, we really wanted to push the schools through first, and then the discussion of how the colleges will be formed like the straw man showed, there were some proposed colleges. But as you can see, within faculty lead proposals for colleges for MCMA and COLA we're still in the negotiation/discussion part of that with the first phase being the schools.

Rimmer- If I could follow up on that. The idea of reorganization being the means of savings, at least as I recall last semester, maybe that was being downplayed so much that it might not lead to any decreases in costs. If that's the case, does that not take away the rationale for getting rid of a college if it doesn't actually save funds?

Chevalier- I think your point is well made, and I will definitely pass it on.

Whaley- You mentioned the need for the board to approve the IBHE recommendation that we use RME's needs for this process. I know that that line is imbedded in a larger resolution that's being discussed at the board. Can you talk about that resolution a little bit and where did it come from?

Chevalier- I think the resolution came from the Provost and the Interim Chancellor, I really wasn't involved in that.

Whaley- Ok, for those who don't know the one item of the resolution is that the board approve the use of the IBHE's recommended process of RME's needs, but it also includes statements that say that the board should approve the reorganization plan that was submitted last year. It's not clear that that includes all the discussions and votes that come out after that plan was presented to the board. So, I have considerable concerns and hope that we can have a bit of a discussion about the resolution, even though not everyone has seen it, but the board is voting on this next week to approve it says, "the administrative reorganization of academic units and the use of reasonable moderate conception process of higher education." That's the title, not the only thing that is in there. This also includes that the Interim President be authorized to take whatever action may be required in the execution of this resolution, and that's fairly vague. It's not clear that all of the discussions that we have had on campus are going to be presented to the board.

Chevalier- Based on my meetings with the IBHE, which have been deferred for too long. Fourteen months ago the conversation with IBHE and what they require for their approval would have been very helpful, but the conversation was not permitted between campus and IBHE, it was limited to the systems office and IBHE. So, when we were able to sit down and finally meet with them, Brad Caldwell called in and participated, we needed to know what IBHE needed for approval. The two things that they told us was one, an understanding from our board that we would be doing this as an RME process, and just an overall communication with them that we were going through a reorganization process. They were not requiring that the board go into detail, which I think is what you are suggesting what are all the campus details going on. That wasn't their requirement, just that they were aware of and approve that we were pursuing reorg, and that the President would have the authority to sign the RMEs. The President does have the authority, however, because this is such a big picture idea, they just wanted to emphasize that that authority rests with the President. This is why you are getting that level of just sort of broad stroke.

Donahoo- The way that the resolution reads is that it's not that the President is going to do more than just sign them, he's just going to sit down and do reorgs of his own and just name whatever he wants.

Chevalier- No I think he's going to give, much like each step, every constituency gives an independent review of the process. I would expect the President to give an independent review, and he has said in more than one meeting "I won't rubber stamp this".

Donahoo- I think it would be helpful to have that reflected in the resolution.

Smith- I know we passed a resolution here last year saying that the Grad Council Chair was to report directly the results of our votes to both the President and Board of Trustees. Are you going to do that?

Calvert- It's in the works. I was waiting on us to have all of the stuff or at least the major bulk of it voted on. I am now assembling our resolutions and our record of the votes of those who reviewed it before us compiled into one document for transmission to the trustees. I hope to have that done today and I will also be making a report in person to the trustees that are meeting next week, at which I plan to summarize what is going on with this.

Smith- I was wondering, if the Council agrees, that you could express concerns about that? If people agree that that particular clause.

Whaley- The other piece of it is that what was in that reorganization plan last year that was presented to the Board was a resolution to change to the colleges and the creation of schools. Approving that now without a college structure means we're going to have all these schools without an administrative home according to the Provost and the uncertainties that go with that. So, there is concern with the vagueness about that because that is in the original plan.

Burnside-Dr. Chevalier what's the rush of the board to have them approve something now? Can't they approve something in February when there's more clarity about where schools are going to exist and not exist?

Chevalier-I agree, but had we known that IBHE wanted the board to be informed of what we're doing that this should have happened 14 months ago. So where as you see, adding a couple more months doesn't matter, and I'm frustrated that we didn't do this step of informing our board and just seeking a broad stroke of approval and seeing what it looks like in the long run. To me we're stuck if we don't go in front of the board.

Whaley- I feel like the Board was apprised of the plan last year. It's not clear to me as to why they need to be apprised again.

Chevalier- Again, with lack of communication until this point with IBHE I can't answer that thoroughly, but I am confident of the conversation that occurred where they didn't feel that the Board was apprised, or they needed evidence that it was apprised and hence that's what we're doing. So, is this like in terms of a formal resolution? I think that's what they are looking for as opposed to a presentation.

Donahoo- Why can't they have a formal resolution where they acknowledge the process and the President's already established authority over it and leave it at that?

Chevalier- I can take that point forward. Within this whole resolution there is a section on academic reorganization which is right before the core, am I correct?

Whaley- Yes. The rationale for the adoption is all about getting rid of the colleges and about other things as well and the benefits of that and enabling multiple disciplinary research and all these other things that in a sense none of that is really relevant. The item that needs to be there is #2, that the board approves the use of the IBHE recommended process. I take issue with how its written.

Jones- I feel lost in this conversation. I can't see where this resolution is on their agenda, and I haven't seen a copy of it. Is it possible to share that amongst the committee here?

Smith- I can send out a copy over to Grad Council email right now (copy of resolution was sent to GC members).

Rimmer- it's page 63 of the board's agenda.

- **Remarks from Vice-Chancellor for Research: Jim Garvey**

Garvey -Annual Reach program has been announced. As you know the Reach Program is research enriched academic challenge program for students. Undergraduates can get up to a \$2,000 stipend for this. The start date for it was December 3rd in terms of getting applications in, and it will close on February 4th. If you have any outstanding undergraduates in your lab, I would encourage them to apply and information is on D2L. You might have heard about the Discovery Partners Institute (DPI). This is to build a physical innovation space in the state of Illinois, and the intent is to take the technology it is developed on campuses throughout the state of Illinois and get them into economic and social activity and incentivize more universities to become more entrepreneurial. U of I wants to buy up a block in downtown Chicago and build a nice big shiny building that they will use for innovation. They want to include all the universities in Illinois as a part of this DPI, not just U of I. We all have to join what they call the Illinois Innovation Network, and they want us to partner with the DPI and use the facilities whenever we want. The idea is to go up there and meet with potential stake holders in the industry, but also to interact with other universities around the world. The first one that they have signed an MOU with is Tel Aviv University and they will be providing content and using content from the DPI in terms of class work, internships, that sort of thing.

Some of you might have heard that NIU is already begun the planning process for building a large research building, which will focus on food, water, and agriculture and the interaction among those things for the price tag of about fifteen million dollars. Now what U of I wants to do is have other universities develop hubs, and each one of those hubs could be up to five million dollars to build a capital project on your campus that will somehow link up with the spirit of what DPI is. That's why we sent a quick request for concept papers/letters of intent for folks around campus to come up with what we might want to develop for five million dollars. They need the proposals in by January 7th, so we don't have a lot of time to

put together a project. They would like it to focus on some major areas of innovation in the state, like agriculture, human health, water, and big data.

Calvert- RFP is for a capital project on this location?

Garvey- Yes it will be somewhere on campus.

- *Remarks from Associate Provost for Academic Programs: Lizette Chevalier*

Chevalier-My earlier comments incorporated these comments.

- *Remarks from Associate Dean & Director of Graduate School: Juliane P. Wallace*

Wallace – We have 155 Masters degrees that we will be conferring in December and 42 Doctoral degrees with a total of 197 graduate degrees. Last year we had a little more, but we still have a pretty good December Graduation. The Center for International Education is actually starting a program to support faculty that are going to conferences, so if you're going to an international conference anyway, they are willing to help support part of that trip if you will engage in these recruiting conversations while you're there. If you have faculty that you know are traveling for these conferences, they can get in contact with me, but we should take advantage of this opportunity.

Whaley- could you just remind us where you are in the discussion with the registrar about the issue of the separate MA and PHD transcripts and the inability of a student in the PHD program who doesn't have a masters to get a masters while there in the PHD program?

Wallace- That's very good timing, I just mentioned that to Dr. Chevalier yesterday. I have not gotten any further in that discussion, so I would be open to help from the Graduate Council in pushing that forward.

Whaley-What we learned from our colleague in computer science is that the grad council has tried to discuss this for a number of years before my time, so I'm interested in helping you.

Wallace- I agree and we are trying to make that process easier, so we do have some forms now so you can do some switching, and the registrar's working with us on this. However, it isn't a clean and clear process and I'm curious, how many of your graduate degrees are on separate transcripts if they were from the same university.

- *Report from GPSC: Rachel Steiger*

Steiger- So the GPSC will be helping out the Graduate School with their final's week programming for stress relief. There is also a campus wide mentoring committee and our long-term goal is to create this mentoring program to help orientation for the graduate school. We have looked into targeting orientation events for graduate students and to improve university websites. We will be improving university websites to better inform students of programs like the mentoring program. There have been many GPSC students interested in creating a grievance communication document to better inform

graduate student on procedures like a brochure. It seems that a good amount of the website needs to be updated in terms of policies.

- **Report from Council Chair: Wesley Calvert**

Calvert- For my report, the Trustees are meeting next week, I am communicating with them. There are upper administrative positions open as well, and that is also likely to be a subject of trustees meeting. They asked at a constituent's heads meeting what things we wanted communicated to the board about what was important for an Interim Chancellor. Several things were mentioned, there seems to be some understanding that we should have a genuine academic who has been a full professor, and someone who recognizes the importance of research and graduate study to the university, who will be an advocate for the Carbondale campus. There is a sharp limitation of the power we have over the trustees at any point, but they are at least aware of some reasonable statement of what I understand to be our feelings on this matter. It's time to be thinking and bringing to appropriate committees, chairs, and the body anything that we know that needs action in the rest of the year, that nagging policy thing that everyone knows is outdated but nobody has actually thought to mention. If you're the one that knows it exists, make sure it gets brought up. Be proactive about what actually needs to be done.

- **Report from Council Vice-Chair: Marc Morris**

Morris- Nothing to report

- **Report from Dean's Council: Terry Clark**

Warwick- My name is John Warwick and I am Dean of the College of Engineering. What I want to do is make a couple of brief comments regarding our most recent Dean's Council meeting that were not already mentioned. We got communication from our Associate Chancellor for Enrollment management. The bad news was first, as some of the incoming students have enough college credit already coming in that they are truly not freshman, so technically we should call them freshman. The bad news is, applications are once again down for the Fall of 2019. There are two different forms of application, like application which means that the student just started the process of application. We know who they are because they started the process, but they haven't yet completed. The next item is actionable application, which means that the student has actually completed the application and we have all the records in meaning that we can either admit or not. For all 3 of those categories: Applications, Actionable Applications and admits those 3 numbers are down. The good news is there is transfer students so in terms of new transfer students, those numbers are up. She mentioned that her goal still for the Fall '19 is to see a modest increase of freshman (1200), so at this point in time it's mostly on us to yield now. We're going to get to that higher number by trying to increase our yield, which means the ratio between the number of students admitted and the number of them that come to register.

Whaley- Could you quickly tell us what new things are being done about the marketing.

Warwick- Yes, she talked about a lot of digital marketing and are moving more to that realm. We

are working with a marketing firm now as well.

Calvert- We are also not their target market

- **Report from Faculty Senate: Jim Wall**

Wall- Senate has a meeting December 11th and everyone is welcome to come. Some things that will be discussed are the discussion of course evaluation. They are being purposed to be entirely online through Desire to Learn, and there is ongoing discussion concerning that. Also continuing discussions on how to develop some synergies with sister campuses and perhaps mending fences along the way. We were made aware of two initiatives, one would be at the undergraduate level to consider moving the core course that every new undergrad takes to familiarize themselves with college life, to consider moving that back toward the college level but along with support. The group that has been working towards the 150th celebration has been modified, reorganized, and reconstituted.

- **Report from University Accreditation Coordinator: RuthAnne Rehfeldt**

Rehfeldt- This afternoon we have a committee meeting for the advisory committee. The assurance argument team has been doing an assessment of our strategic plan in recent months and what we will be presenting to the steering committee this afternoon is an update on evidence that we have collected that shows how we have attained some of the goals that were specified in the 2013 strategic plan and we'll be asking for input on the what we have identified in that evidence.

- **Report from Program Review Committee: Sue Rimmer**

Rimmer- The main development is that Lizette has asked the Graduate Council to look at the review criteria for centers. The program review committee will come up with some suggestions for a review process for the centers.

- **Report from New Programs Cimmittee: Sajal Lahiri**

Lahiri- We have received one RME two days ago and will deal with it early next semester.

- **Report from Educational Policies Committee: Julie Partridge**

Partridge- Those of you on that committee will be getting an email soon, and we have a couple of items that we'll be looking at starting also early in next semester. One is the idea of requesting that domestic graduate students also be given the instate tuition break as undergraduate students are, so we are going to be exploring that, and Dr. Wallace has some numbers for us to kind of indicate how many we're talking about and what the difference would be that we would have to make up an additional students, and also looking at some policy that's in the catalog regarding undergrads taking graduate credit and the current need for them to apply to the graduate school and trying to find ways to make it easier for them and explore a couple of classes and improving recruitment that way. The resolution on student responsibility regarding animal activity and research, so we would like to present that as written.

Calvert- This is now the second reading of this resolution. Is there any discussion on it before we vote?

In Favor-20
Against-0
Abstain-0

RESOLUTION PASSES

- [*\(Presented by Tomas Velasco\) First Reading: Resolution on the Policy Involving Research with Dogs and Cats*](#)
- [*Resolution Student Responsibility Regarding Animal Activities*](#)

Narayan – My name is Prema Narayan, I am in the department of Physiology. My question is what is the point of this resolution?

Velasco- This is from the committee, so I am going to summarize what the committee said. We wanted to accommodate this research, but this research based on this law implies that there has to be an adoption policy/facility that implies money. The committee decided that perhaps this is not the right moment to have that facility, so consequently we really cannot have that policy.

Calvert- the question is about what's the difference between passing this resolution and simply not acting at all.

Narayan- There really shouldn't be a financial burden to the university.

Velasco- Ok I am not an expert in this topic, but I'll let the experts do the talking.

Haniotakis- Do we have this type of research on this campus?

Narayan-We had an instance where we had a researcher wanted to use animals and was not able to do that. There was a sub-contract where SIU purchased the animals, and so technically SIU will own the animals, so we had to have this policy in place, as a result we couldn't do the sub-contract, and if that grant had been awarded you would have had \$5,000 dollars in indirect cost which we have now lost. So, it seems to me that the indirect cost will more than pay for all financial burden.

Velasco- ok, I want to call the experts in the committee, please.

Jones- I am the chair of the new research committee and also the chair of IACUC, so I have recused myself from doing anything more than providing information to the committee has asked of me. So, the reason that this even came to the research committee attention was because we were asked to investigate whether this was a policy that could be supported for the creation of an adoption facility for dogs and cats, and that was the charge that was given to the committee. I asked the committee to not because this is a policy that is broader than any one proposal, and we are not debating the merit of a proposal at all. What would happen is do we or don't we want a policy, so that was the charge that was given and the topic that was discussed.

Narayan- As a biomedical researcher I would argue very strongly that we should have a policy, so that if it becomes necessary everything has a place to do the research.

Jones- I would also say that that specific proposal has its own challenges for getting through the La Cook process. One of the very important stipulations is that the La Cook committee has to have the ability to oversee the housing and care of those animals. If we own these animals and we've given them to another location, we still have authority to tell these people how they manage the animals. Having them physically located in a facility that is not controlled by SIU becomes problematic in that instance.

Steiger- So I serve on this committee and it seems that the adoption policy is ok, but liability could be an issue.

Calvert- Jim would you speak to this issue?

Garvey- Roughly 25% of IDC, the generator of this campus, is sucked up off the top before anyone ever sees it. It goes to different school issues, then the distribution model goes to the generating unit, VC, and the Chancellor. There are lots of cost to do research on campus and typically the overhead never gets back to the generating unit, so it's just spread out to support research in general. The point is that I don't know what the cost are of taking care of these animals and doing adoption programs, but a single grant supporting this kind of research is not going to support a program that involves taking care of the animals. The fees associated with the research and a long-term commitment that we make, and I haven't looked into it so I don't know what that would be.

Ellsworth- I know in discussions with Springfield they have a policy written so that they can enact it if they wish, so at least they're prepared and if they decide they want to at least they have a policy written so they can dust it off and publish it.

Velasco- The issue seems to be with the cost of taking care of the animals.

Ellsworth- I would suggest that cost could be largely incorporated into the grant.

Ran- Research on dogs and cats is extraordinarily important for translation of biomedical research. This policy is very important to medical research so I think our research should be preserved and put our input into making the decision in this issue.

Burnside- We need to have a policy in place so that research that isn't grant funded isn't affected by this, so there's a larger issue beyond grant funding.

Partridge- What are the policies in place at other universities in the state that have to contend with this adoption policy. That would be a good indicator of the best approach for us to take.

Jensik- UIC and Urbana Champagne all have policies and it isn't just a dog and cat policy, it's for all animals except for rodents. It will allow for a policy to be developed if someone had to do dog and cat research, and we don't usually just jump to them, then a separate conversation can be had about how this is all set up. A lot of these policies push this on to the PI and I think if we look at some of the other policies we can find one that will work for SIUC.

Calvert- How much lead time do you need to know when you need to move to a dog study?

Jensik- Man, I wish I knew. It could happen at any point in a study, and science changes daily.

Lahiri- There are two issues here. One is the money and the other is ethical. The money is not important, and if the project itself can fund on the cost that you are talking about, why not have a policy without committing any funds and every project has to satisfy the law. When you apply for a grant make sure that is your responsibility.

Velasco- This is the first reading and based on our discussion we will probably have to table, and we will have other meetings so when this resolution is ready, we are going to bring it to the council.

Garvey- I really appreciate that we are having this conversation and we should take our time on it. Often the end point per research on dogs and cats is euthanasia and you can't adopt them. This goes beyond medical research, we have folks that do canine research on campus that's associated with canine behavior and nutrition. Currently the subjects are volunteers of people's pets and there is no threat to them, they are just helping. So, if we get into this business, let's think beyond the medical side of it, as it could be a very positive spin on campus if we develop the right policy.

Partridge- I know that a lot of beagles are used in this research. I have two, and we could just say ill adopt all of the beagles and we can take care of this and ill have 500 dogs and be happy. That's our policy. Write that down. I'll adopt them all! I'm committing to it.

Calvert- I want everyone to know who the committee is that has this under discussion. Dr. Velasco, Ran, Babcock, Jones, and Ms. Stieger.

Velasco- Anyone her that wants to participate, I highly invite you

Calvert- These are the people you need to be in touch with if you have any more insights on this matter. Also, I'll advise the committee that I will be sensitive to any points of order that may be raised about clarifying the difference between passing the resolution and not passing it that's not entirely clear to me in the current version. When we consider a resolution and bring it to a vote there will be a difference between the first and second reading, so if it comes back for a second reading and there is no difference, I will be sensitive to someone raising the point of order that it cannot be properly considered until we know what the difference is.

Partridge- You mentioned that there are 25 faculty hires happening this year. Is there any discussion or knowledge of faculty hires moving forward for next year?

Chavalier- I don't know that answer

Whaley- I will make a motion that the grad council express disapproval of the resolution discussed earlier.

Donahue- seconds

Awsumb- [Suggestions for Clause 1 and 4.](#)

Calvert- The sense of this body that objects to the current wording of the resolution and these are the phrases we object to and what we wish were different. I can work that into a communication with the board.

Smith- Proposes amendment that the goal of reorganization is to create schools.

Calvert- We now have an amendment before us. The amendment with the sense of the body is that the problems are those identified in Clay's edits to the resolution.

Velasco- Seconds

In Favor-19 Against-0 Abstain-0

AMENDMENT PASSES

Calvert- We now have Ellsworth's amendment as amended to replace the original statement that we disapprove of this resolution to state these specific items that we disagree with.

Burnside- Motion to suspend rules

Whaley- Seconds

Calvert- All in favor of suspending rules?

In Favor-18 Against-0 Abstain-1

RULES SUSPENDED

Calvert- All in favor of the motion as amended?

In Favor-17 Against-0 Abstain-2

MOTION PASSES

Partridge- Move to reinstate the rules

Jones- Seconds

In Favor-19 Against-0 Abstain-0

RULES REESTABLISHED

Calvert- Do we motion to adjourn?

Burnside- Motions

Stieger- Seconds

- *The Chairperson adjourns meeting at 9:53PM*