

MEETING OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

March 4, 2010

Members and Administrative Officers Present:

Sara Baer; Gargi Bhattacharya (GPSC); Thomas Britton; David Carlson; Judith Davie; John Dobbins; Daniel Dyer; Anne Fletcher (Ryan Netzley); Samuel Goldman; John Groninger; Eric Hellgren; Phillip Howze; Jodi Huggenvik; Holly Hurlburt; Scott Ishman (Ken Anderson); Kimberly Kempf-Leonard (Matt Giblin); Mark Kittleson; John A. Koropchak; Pat Manfredi; Scott McClurg; Jay Means (Deans Council); Christian Moe; Manoj Mohanty (Sam Spears); Nancy Mundschenk; Ryan Netzley; Mark Peterson; Elyse Pineau; Alicia Swan; Keith Waugh, David Wilson; Tomasz Wiltkowski; Bryan Young.

Members and Administrative Officers Absent

Leslie Lloyd; Don Rice; Prudence Rice; and William Stevens

Chairman Hellgren called the meeting of the Graduate Council to order on March 4, 2010 at 8:00 a.m. in the Missouri/Kaskaskia Room of the Student Center.

Announcement of Proxies – Chairman Hellgren announced that Ryan Netzley will have Anne Fletcher's proxy and Sam Spears is here for Manoj Mohanty.

1. **Consideration of minutes of the February 4, 2010 Graduate Council meeting.**

A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded; the minutes were approved unanimously.

2. **North Central Accreditation meeting with Graduate Council – Jim Allen**

Chairman Hellgren introduced Dr. Jim Allen to the Council who was present to talk about the North Central Accreditation. Dr. Allen announced that the Self-Study is complete and can be accessed via the SIUC web page. He said the information in the document is easy to access online by using a key word search. He stated it was important for everyone to be familiar with the main themes which can be learned by reading the introduction. The introduction explains the self-study process, who is involved in the process and, to some extent, our challenges and what we are doing to meet those challenges. The Graduate Council will be visiting with two members of the Site Visitation Team on Monday, March 22 at 1 p.m. in the Mississippi room. The two members with whom the Council will meet are Dr. Peter J. Kavinsky, Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies from Youngstown University and Dr. Nancy Ellen Mathews, Professor and Chair of Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Dr. Allen

will communicate with Chairman Hellgren regarding any details that may become available about the visitation.

Dr. Allen outlined issues that may be discussed stating that the first concern is shared governance or research. The Graduate Council is a constituency group and represents a very important faculty interest. He also added it would be important to think of questions the Graduate Council may want to ask. The Site visit team members are called consultant evaluators with the emphasis on consultant. He remarked that during the last ten years, the Graduate Council has had a major role in defining program reviews, has supported and helped establish an Office for Vice Chancellor for Research, and had considerable input on the *Southern at 150* report, graduate assistantships and stipends, Plagiarism Committee and policy, and reviews of research facilities. He stated that the Graduate Council has had an on-going role in campus leadership by participating in search committees for administrative leaders. It is important to think about the many contributions made by the Graduate Council to SIUC in the last ten years.

Dr. Allen said that those on the Council who cannot make the early morning meeting may want to attend the open faculty meeting scheduled for 4 p.m. on Monday, March 22, in the Museum Auditorium.

Results should be received within six weeks after the site visit but the Chancellor will have a summary of their response on the day they leave on March 24. The Committee is required to provide something in writing within 6 months. We have to respond to the committee's report on the site visitation.

3 **Remarks – Chancellor Goldman**

Chancellor Goldman thanked Jim Allen for the time and effort that he put into preparing the self-study document. The Council responded with a round of applause for Dr. Allen's efforts.

Chancellor Goldman began by stating there is a difference between budget and cash flow. At the beginning of 2010 we had a tough budget but we put it together, even though we took some cuts. It was when the State stopped sending payments is when we began having problems. The state only provided 28-30% of what they owe us, which causes a cash flow problem. The State owes us about \$90 million. The President has gone to the legislature to ask to borrow money against what the state owes us. In the same way that public schools borrow money against taxes, we could borrow up to 75% in anticipation of receiving state funds owed to us. We have through August to borrow and will have about a year to pay it back. The budget director for the State has told us we will be paid in full, they just can't tell us when. This year we do not anticipate furloughs or layoffs. However, the legislature is talking about a 10% rescission yet this year, which would be devastating. The Chancellor does not think this legislation will pass.

Chancellor Goldman stated that in Fiscal Year 2011, we will be facing very difficult times. The stimulus money we received this year will go away. We are anticipating about a \$15 million shortfall. The Chancellor stated he has put together a budget team. This team is made up of people responsible for budget and personnel so that we do not overstep our boundaries as to what is legal, ethical, and what has been negotiated. The Working Group is developing templates of various scenarios. He stated he has asked all personnel responsible for budget at the university to prepare a budget with a 10% reduction and show where cuts will be made. The second area we will be looking at is the possibility of furloughs. We will start with salary level and the number of days we propose to get to the bottom line and we are breaking them down by budget categories. We have also discussed the possibility of layoffs. He noted that we had a hiring freeze this year and usually by this time we have hired about 50-60 faculty. This year we have only hired 12. It is possible by attrition, retirement, and unfilled positions that we will have funds to use against the possibility of furloughs or layoffs. Another area we are looking at is campus closure. Some campuses across the country have closed a day or two a year. In most instances the closures have been before or after a holiday. He emphasized that, under no circumstances, will he consider cutting graduate assistantships.

Chancellor Goldman stated that the working group is looking at 4 or 5 templates and will work through them to see which one gives the least damage. In his judgment we will not use just one template but will most likely take something from each one. We will be asking our deans and others to take a very serious look at their programs. There are some marginal programs and by marginal he said he meant in terms of enrollment or centrality to the mission of the university. We have to begin to cull some of the programs. The reason this is not a viable option at this time is because tenured faculty are involved.

The major source of income for us is enrollment. We cannot afford to have a modest decline in enrollment. A decline of 100 students equals \$1 million. He indicated the good news is that we are seeing a reduction of veterans on the state program. He indicated most are going to the federal program, which is a direct payment to us. Chancellor Goldman stated that there will be many discussions before any final decisions are made. He added his administrative style is somebody does the homework and then we lay out what we know to people who will help us make decisions. Right now, he said, we are in the homework stage. Once we have accumulated all the information, we will lay out the options and then we will go to groups, such as the Graduate Council, and lay them out and ask for their advice and input.

Professor Spears asked about the interest on loans that will have to be paid and consequently add to our cash-flow problems. Chancellor Goldman responded that borrowing is a last resort; and maybe the state will come through. We will also get

some preferential treatment from the lenders; but there will be some interest that will have to be paid.

Professor Tom Britton asked Chancellor Goldman for names of the members that make up the advisory committee that help make budget decisions. The Chancellor responded that this is a working group, not an advisory committee, and this group is looking at options, not making decisions. He further stated that Carol Henry, Director of the Budget Office; Kevin Bame, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance; Kathy Blackwell, Director of Human Resources; and Brent Patton are all members of the working group. Professor Britton asked if there is faculty representation, to which Chancellor Goldman responded not yet, we are just doing the homework on this. The Chancellor again stated his object is to gather information and doing the homework because we have a short turnaround. Putting the templates together is time consuming because it requires massive data collection, understanding the state laws and what has been negotiated on campus. Professor Young asked about the 10% plan and asked if he will be looking at enrollment within units? Chancellor Goldman responded he thinks they will have to do so. He stated he has asked the Deans to show enrollment growth and they have tried and some colleges have begun to turn around. Chancellor Goldman stated that they are very seriously looking at those colleges and departments that have suffered heavy enrollment declines. We will be looking at colleges' productivity and are gathering data on credit hours and FTE.

4. **Remarks – Interim Provost Rice**

Interim Provost Rice was not in attendance.

5. **Announcements**

Vice Chancellor for Research John Koropchak

VCR Koropchak gave an update on grants and contracts. We are through 2/3 of the fiscal year and we are at \$55 million which is a 20% increase over the same time last year. Two areas that continue to be strong are research awards which are up 42% at \$24 million and federal awards, which are up 45% at \$22 million. Both are up \$7 million from the same time last year. We are beginning to accumulate data on graduate applications and admissions. It is too early to make an assessment of that and this is the beginning of a critical time to recruit students. He urged the council to aggressively recruit, admit and attract new students for next fiscal year.

We are continuing the Annual Research Town Meeting. The date will be April 19 and the keynote speaker will be incoming Chancellor Rita Cheng. He added he is confident the members of the Graduate Council and their colleagues will be interested to hear what she has to say. We have invited many people to attend the Research Town Meeting over the years, with mixed success. We have invited

Community College presidents and many of them attend. In addition we have invited the Board of Trustees each year and for the first time, we have a Board Member that has accepted that invitation. Mr. Roger Tedrick, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, has indicated he will be attending. It is important to demonstrate to the Chairman of the Board what research means individually to the university and our students.

Professor Sara Baer asked if the undergraduate research symposium will be on the same day and Dr. Koropchak stated he believes it is on the same day but he will verify and let her know.

We have talked for several years about doing a survey of the faculty research climate on campus. Since we have a new incoming Chancellor, we have decided to go ahead with that survey now. We think this will be valuable to us and also to Dr. Cheng.

Good News

Professor Mark Kittleson was elected a Fellow in the American Association of Health Educators. The Council congratulated Professor Kittleson with a round of applause. VCR Koropchak also announced we have a team of faculty and students that was selected for a Global Venture Challenge at Oak Ridge National Labs. He further stated that this is a business plan contest based on inventions that faculty have developed. SIUC is one of 22 institutions worldwide that was selected as finalists for this. There are representatives from Canada, Spain, India, Belgium, and China and from very prestigious land grant colleges in the United States. Our team is directed by Dr. Andre Kolmakov from the Department of Physics who is leader of the project called “electronic nano nose.”

This year we have two students attending the Nobel Laureates meeting in Lindau, Germany. He noted that Laura Walkup from the Chemistry Department, nominated by Dr. Boyd Goodson, and Michael Flister from the MBM program, nominated by Dr. Sophie Ran in the School of Medicine, will be attending this event where they will be among 75 other students selected nationwide to attend. We are very proud of their accomplishments.

Associate Dean Wilson

The Morris Fellowship announcements have been made. The doctoral fellowship announcements should be out early next week to departments. The Masters fellowship will have to wait until after Spring Break. The Apply Yourself implementation is in process and we have been working closely with them. Dr. Sinha is taking the lead on this project, which is a huge undertaking. We will have it up and operational in spring 2011. We have communicated with all departments asking if they have a specific need beyond the basic graduate school application to let us know what those needs are. We are trying to set up about 3 templates for a

secondary application that would gather that information. In some cases what we may actually do is put in a link to whatever is already developed electronically. He also spoke about enrollment and our number of applications is about what they were at this time last year. He asked everyone to encourage their departments to take a look at the column that says no decision especially students who for some reason have not completed their application. If you see students that look good, please contact them to get them to complete their application.

We have sent out information to departments about the Excellence through Commitment Graduate School Scholarship and we will maintain the same level to those departments who participated last year. We do have some remaining awards to commit. This is a program that discounts graduate student tuition by roughly 1/3. We want these to be made in the same way you would offer an assistantship in writing in advance to new students. Programs have had success with this. The Anthropology program has three students and they say none would be here without that discount. The scholarship is primarily aimed at master's students. In some cases, you might have somebody who you want to start in a Ph.D. program but have some reservations about; this might be a way to start them out to see if they can do the work.

Professor Mundschenk asked how graduate assistant dollars are allocated and Associate Dean Wilson stated it is based mostly on history. Ninety percent of the funds are under the Provost's control and ten percent is given to VCR Koropchak. VCR Koropchak stated these TAA dollars are assigned based upon measures of commitment to the graduate assistantships in the college as well as minority graduate enrollment. The provost's funds are negotiated between the college and the provost. She asked if there have been changes over time and Dean Wilson stated that he believes there have been some changes, for instance, when there is a new program or special project. Dean Wilson added that this spring we had more than 1700 graduate assistantships on campus and added some of the growth is coming in grant funding. We are seeing more RA's supported on non-state accounts.

Professor Britton asked for a point of privilege to speak before Chairman Hellgren's comments because he had to leave for an appointment soon. Permission was given by Chairman Hellgren for Professor Britton to continue. Professor Britton stated he is troubled by Chancellor Goldman's comments about collection of information that will not include faculty representation. He further stated that he understands that this is just collecting information, but with collection of information comes analysis; and he would like to see a broader representation in those councils when we begin the analysis. Professor Britton further stated that we are about to enter a critical time in the next two to three years where we are going to make some decisions about the university and its programs and how we accomplish our mission. He believes that at a minimum, we need faculty representation on each of those bodies that consider budget recommendations. He also stated he further thinks that we need representation from our Deans because we are talking about

impacts on academic programs. He stated his fear is that, without some representation, they will take a cookie cutter approach. Professor Britton supports the Chancellor's sentiments with regard to graduate students. However, he asked the Council to imagine the same kind of edict being issued with respect to furloughs, layoffs, and program reductions. Those kinds of decisions need more wide-based participation. The Deans should not be handed an edict to furlough people for five days. Professor Britton asked the Council to not let any more decisions be made without faculty input. He added it is unknown where the Planning and Budget Committee fits into the scheme of things, adding that this Committee is the Graduate Council's opportunity to influence basic budget decisions. He stated he was on that committee for a time and stated the Committee members were told what was going to take place. In this case, he added he does not know where the Chancellor will be receiving good input from faculty and Deans. He pointed out that neither the Provost nor the Vice Chancellor for Research nor any of the deans were named as being on the working group. When the discussion gets to new business on the agenda, he would like the Council to consider a motion that ensures the chancellor will have faculty and deans represented at all of these budget discussions.

Chairman Hellgren asked Dean Means and VCR Koropchak if they have been asked for a 10% cut in their respective units and how they proposed to do it. Dean Means stated he has been asked for a range of cuts that go beyond 10% and below 10%. He further stated that the Deans have been frustrated with their role in the whole process because they have asked, for more than a year, for information about non-academic units that receive state dollars. We have asked for information on that as a way of understanding more fully where the state dollars are going in the university. For the most part, that information has not been forthcoming. We have asked for decisions to be made early so that we would have some flexibility. Right now we are in the information-gathering stage as was articulated by the Chancellor and that information will feed into some kind of decision-making process of which we will probably not be involved in. Professor Britton stated that, as the Chancellor noted, we are talking about finishing up this year and possibly making additional cuts yet this year. And there will be substantial cuts in fiscal year 2011 and 2012. We need a longer-term plan and a set of basic values that drive the decisions.

VCR Koropchak stated that at the Chancellors Executive Planning Committee meeting last week, we looked at a range of scenarios. He was at a Dean's Council on Tuesday where there was a completely different set of scenarios laid out. Today he heard a different set of scenarios. In the OVCR/GD area, he started a planning process a month or two ago to look at a set of scenarios. We have a sense of what kind of impact a range of budget cuts would be. One other thing is there was a meeting at the President's office on Monday where the President outlined his perspective on the budget situation. There is an article in the *Southern Illinoisan* today that outlined some of his comments. But the data seems to be inconsistent with other things he has heard. He knows there are other Vice Chancellors that are concerned about the level of discussion taking place on these issues and he believes

that having a resolution from this body that encourages a broader and more inclusive discussion in that regard would be valuable.

Professor Scott McClurg stated that one of the things that troubled him about Dean Means statement is they have asked for more information about non-academic units and if we do have a resolution, we must call for greater openness in the budgetary process. Bottom line, what is the growth in the budget or the decline in the budget across academic units versus administrative units is a fundamentally important thing to know. VCR Koropchak stated that, in the past, when there are budget cuts occurring by functional area, the tradition has been that although the average cut for campus is at a certain level, the level for academic affairs has been the lowest of all. The level has risen to areas such as athletics and so on. He would like to see that kind of differentiation included in the discussion this time as well. The academic side of the university is the core of the university. This is where the work of the university occurs. We should protect the core mission of the university in teaching students and doing research. That should be given the highest priority. Professor Britton's suggestion to get some kind of assurance that there will be academic input in the final decision making is an important point.

Professor Mark Kittleson stated we need to have some input in the working group that the Chancellor spoke about. VCR Koropchak commented that what the Chancellor means by the working group are people who have knowledge of laws, regulations and civil service statutes and know what kind of savings furloughs would provide and what are the issues we would have to deal with in regard to bargaining. He thinks that is what the Chancellor believes his working group is charged with looking into. Professor Kittleson said that particular working group has no faculty representation, are we asking for representation on that working group as well as on other groups and asked why can't this committee report to the Chancellor's Budget and Planning Committee? Chairman Hellgren says that goes back to the Faculty Senate resolution to which the Graduate Council declined to address; leaving it to Chancellor Cheng to put together her own committees. Dean Means said that other Deans would line up behind a resolution because working groups come together and gather information all the time and by the time it is fully available to the Deans, it is too late to do anything and so we are locked into situations that are impressed upon the colleges without any say from the faculty.

Chairman Hellgren called for a motion to suspend the rules. Professor Scott McClurg made the motion; seconded by Professor Ryan Netzley, motion passed.

Professor Ryan Netzley proposed the following resolution:

READING OF THE RESOLUTION

The Graduate Council encourages the Chancellor to include representatives from the faculty and deans in his current budget working group and any other budgetary decision making groups. The Graduate Council also encourages the Chancellor to

provide said committee, particularly faculty members and deans, budgetary information about non-academic units. Finally, the Graduate Council reminds the Chancellor that a committee already exists for this purpose, the Chancellor's Planning and Budget Committee, and is already constituted.

A friendly amendment was made to take out the word "other" in the first sentence to make it read "...and any budgetary decision-making groups." Nancy Mundschenk made another friendly amendment to change "encourages" in the first sentence to "requests" thereby making the first sentence read: "The Graduate Council requests the Chancellor....."

Chairman Hellgren called the question and by voice vote the resolution, as amended, was unanimously approved by the Graduate Council. Chairman Hellgren asked Ryan Netzley to send the resolution to him.

Associate Dean Wilson asked to make a comment at this time. When you think about the 4.5% increase in tuition instituted for freshmen this year, and amortize it over 4 years, you will find a negative cash flow. He further stated that we are bound by the rules of the State that is crippling us and every other public educational institution in the state. We have a serious problem both political and local. The current Board of Trustees wants a 0% increase in tuition next year. Based on this information, our cash flow is going to get dramatically worse.

Chairman Hellgren called for a motion to restore the rules. A motion to restore the rules was made by Professor McClurg and seconded by Professor Kittleson. Motion approved unanimously.

6. **Announcements – Professor Hellgren**

Chairman Hellgren, in his role as a member of the Parking and Traffic Committee, gave an update on the parking proposal. There will be no increase in parking fees for FY11. The proposal involved going from a 3-tiered system to a 4-tiered system so that those making over \$70,000 a year would be paying more. He thanked everyone who gave comments so that he could pass them on to the Committee. Chairman Hellgren noted that across the constituency group, there was really no concerns or problems with the raise in parking fees and when we do vote for this in FY12, it will probably be passed. There are increased costs that the Parking and Traffic Division will have, such as constructing and maintaining the parking lots at the new stadium and new student services building. The funding that comes from parking fees and tickets goes toward maintenance, construction, fixing lighting and a number of other things they are doing.

Another issue discussed was the guest parking pass. Previously departments could get free parking stickers for guests; however, if you were hosting a conference, you had to pay \$4 for each sticker. The abuse that was occurring with guest parking

stickers caused a proposed change to \$3 for guest parking across the board, regardless of what it is. It will be easier for departments to purchase guest parking stickers in advance.

There was also an issue with gold tags which are given to employees with 20 years of service, and emeritus gold stickers which are also given to retirees who may only have five years of service. There will be a gold hanging tag for people with more than 20 years of service. There will be information in the handbook that states that gold stickers will only go to employees or retirees with 20 years of service. This proposal was not voted upon at this meeting but will be at the next meeting.

7. **Open Access Committee – Scott McClurg**

Prior to reading the two resolutions, Scott McClurg summarized the reason for two resolutions. A resolution was previously introduced by Dean Carlson to require all faculty members, within reasonable limits, to publish all their research to the open SIUC resource. It was the Council's decision to set up a committee to look and discuss these issues, rather than taking that step. In the committee we presented a wide array of options consistent with the idea of encouraging more open access to the research that goes on at SIUC. In the context of our deliberations we did not really hone in as a committee on one particular option. There were some folks, of which he was one, felt that anything short of a mandate was not a very useful resolution. Another thought that the resolution should include an educational statement of support for open access rather than pushing for a mandate. We could not ultimately agree on one resolution so we created two resolutions that were consistent with the general principles of two different sides of deliberations. The recommendation was to present both resolutions to the committee and then have the Graduate Council decide what they felt was the best way to go forward. He stated it is possible to vote for both resolutions with a statement of support and support the action.

READING OF FIRST RESOLUTION

Open Access Policy: A Model of Action for Faculty Choice

Whereas the faculty of Southern Illinois University Carbondale are committed to widening the dissemination of its scholarship and research while simultaneously maintaining its high quality;

Whereas Open Access publishing of journal articles shows potential to decrease budgetary pressures on library acquisitions and to increase the availability and access to research and scholarship, especially when such models are adopted by a large number of universities;

Whereas Open Access publishing also promises to facilitate interdisciplinary inquiry and increase citation rates for faculty scholarship and research in certain

areas of specialization, particularly those without a centralized and reliable article indexing service;

Whereas Open Access also provides a platform for publishing university research and making it freely available to the public thereby creating a useful public relations tool for the university and serve as an example of faculty contribution to social needs, community issues and local culture;

Therefore be it resolved that the Graduate Council calls on all faculty members to grant SIUC permission to make his or her scholarly journal articles openly accessible in OpenSIUC. In legal terms, such permission shall be an irrevocable, non-exclusive, paid up worldwide license to exercise all rights under copyright for purpose of making the scholarly articles openly accessible provided that the articles are not sold for income or profit. This license shall in no way interfere with the rights of the faculty author as the copyright holder of the work and shall incorporate exceptions as may be required due to intractable publisher requirements, permission/usage rights restrictions or cost, or other issues as may occur.

Therefore be it also resolved that the Graduate Council directs the library to develop the language for such a license incorporating these principles and to survey and solicit all faculty members for permission.

READING OF SECOND RESOLUTION:

Open Access Policy: A Statement of Support

The faculty of Southern Illinois University Carbondale are committed to the widest possible dissemination of their scholarly research and intellectual output. Access to such research is essential to all members of the academic community. This principle is not always in harmony with the business practices of journal publishers, which increasingly constrain the ability of libraries to provide access to the scholarly literature. Further, publication typically requires the assignment of copyright to the publisher. By assuming all rights, including sole distribution rights, publishers gain a monopoly over the published results of researches and scholars. Faculty, staff, students and university administrators must assume more responsibility for the scholarly communication system.

Therefore, the Graduate Council calls on all faculty, staff and students of Southern Illinois University Carbondale to become familiar with the pricing and business practices of journals and journal publishers in their specialty. It further calls on faculty to consider these practices when submitting articles or publication, or participating in journal editorial activities.

The Graduate Council also recommends that all authors familiarize themselves with the terms regarding copyright and distribution rights in any publication agreement

they sign, and to request a non-exclusive distribution right for themselves when such rights are not already specifically granted in the agreement. This distribution right should include the right to post a version of the article in an institutional repository.

Finally, the Graduate Council calls upon all faculty to post their articles in OpenSIUC, whenever possible. OpenSIUC is SIUC's institutional repository, and provides the means to distribute scholarly research beyond the abilities or practices of most publishers.

Discussion

Professor McClurg pointed out that included with these resolutions is a document entitled *Open Access Contribution from the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities* to help you understand that we are not talking about Open Access Journals but rather open access dissemination of research that is published elsewhere. Professor McClurg announced that Jonathan Nave from the Library, who also served on the committee and SIUC's repository archivist, is present to answer questions.

Professor Pineau asked for clarification about what is meant in the second sentence of the second paragraph of the Statement of Support where it says: "It further calls on faculty to consider these practices when submitting articles for publication, or participating in journal editorial activities." Professor McClurg stated that some publishers have much different rules about open access, such as some consider it to be a version that is not the final typeset and some do not care. He reads this to say to consider all the possibilities before submitting your research. Professor Pineau indicated there is only one national journal available in her field to publish so she does not have much choice. Professor McClurg explained that it is possible she may have more next year or in the future. Everyone realizes there are a number of considerations when publishing. The visibility and ranking of the journal is important, but all this is saying is to consider this among all the other factors to consider. The statement of support does not require any faculty action.

Professor Kittleson asked about resolution number two, a model of action, and the statement that calls upon "...all faculty to make his or her scholarly journal articles open accessible....." Professor McClurg stated that this resolution does not make it mandatory for the faculty to do this, but is more of, you should do it and the library will solicit you to do it but you will still have choice.

Professor Meehan stated that, to her knowledge, in the College of Mass Communication and Media Arts, there is no publisher that allows the author of a journal article to retain copyrights. In our area, there is a tendency for journals which have traditionally been published by academic associations to become published by private companies. If I'm going to publish in a journal, I have to sign over my copyrights.

Mr. Nave commented that he could not sit here today and quote chapter and verse, but that he would bet there are some open access journals within her field. There is a directory of open access journals and I can check that out. I think you probably have more choice than you think. About 60-70% of commercial journals do allow authors to deposit their articles in institutional repositories, but many faculty do not pursue that option. Part of this is saying to be a little more aggressive about the rights you do have that you may be unaware of. When you look at the research on academic publishing, the number of fields is decreasing and the publishers who control large sectors are tightening their control over what becomes their property. Jonathan Nave responded that the largest publishers all allow authors to deposit their articles in an institutional repository. It may not be the PDF that is in the journal itself but they do allow a version to be deposited into an institutional repository.

Professor Netzley stated that only 20% of the major renaissance journals allow open access so that differential value is part of the problem. There are differences between colleges and even in colleges on that subject. Jonathan Nave stated he has been doing this for many years and emphatically stated that the majority of your articles can go into an open access institutional repository. Mr. Nave recommended that faculty check the agreement that they sign which should spell out your rights, or check out the publisher's website that spells out what your rights are. He stated that most of the time, you do not even have to ask to deposit an article in an institutional repository. Professor McClurg backed that up by stating that he checked with publishers where he has previously submitted articles and in almost 90% of those asked said it was okay to deposit into an institutional repository.

Professor Howze remarked that since this is the first reading of these resolutions, the Faculty Senate stands ready to follow whatever the Graduate Council decides to do. The resolutions will be changed to be joint resolutions coming from the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. Professor Howze said these resolutions will be distributed at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate and presented as a first reading.

Professor Pineau asked if the repository can handle other kinds of research in addition to print media like audio, video, live performance, etc. The answer is yes, except when there are copyrights involved and a fee is paid to perform a particular play or piece of music. Jonathan Nave stated that they can accommodate any electronic format -- conference presentations, proceedings, videos, and educational support materials you develop for a classroom. You can find out what is allowed by googling OpenSIUC and it spells it out. She stated she would be happy to see other types of venues besides print media put into the resolution. Scott McClurg recommended a friendly amendment to also add other venues in addition to written media to these resolutions.

Professor Netzley stated the downside is that we have not considered the possibility that open access institutional repositories actually impede the development of open access journals. The exigency is that we have journals that are too expensive and the payoff is that you can break up Blackwell. But the problem is we are relying on the content on those very journals for peer review. He further stated that the very issue of propping up an institutional repository seems at cross purposes. If we were to put together as a series of open access journals, not as an institutional repository, then there is no downside. Jonathan Nave said that all empirical evidence says that institutional repositories have been growing and the number of open access journals have been growing as well. It is definitely not suppressing the development of open access journals. Institutional repositories are meeting an immediate need to get information where people do not have access to a library. The University of California had over a million downloads since they began.

At this time, Chairman Hellgren stopped the discussion, and said if members Professor McClurg and he will provide them at the next meeting. It was encouraged that the Graduate Council share these resolutions with their colleagues. These resolutions will be voted upon at the next meeting.

8. **Report of Research Committee – Professor Netzley for Professor Mohanty**

READING OF RESOLUTION

Ryan Netzley read the resolution on Junior Faculty Teaching Load Reduction.

Whereas SIUC possesses a strong commitment to research, scholarly activity and teaching;

Whereas, SIUC seeks to encourage junior faculty members' pursuit of ambitious research and scholarly activities;

Whereas, extensive time commitment is necessary to develop transformative research and scholarly activities;

Whereas many new assistant professors at SIUC's peer and aspirational peer institutions commonly have an option of negotiating teaching load reductions prior to tenure;

Therefore, be it resolved that SIUC colleges, grant a teaching load reduction within the first three years of tenure-track appointments for new assistant professors seeking to establish a nationally recognized research program or scholarly activity with demonstrable impacts on student learning.

Therefore, be it further resolved that Units/Departments at SIUC create a mechanism for negotiating teaching load reduction for junior faculties subject to satisfying the overall teaching commitments of the unit/department.

Discussion

A short discussion ensued regarding this resolution and the possibility that it may cause negative consequences for the deans. The Committee said they did have discussions about timing of this resolution with regard to the current budgetary climate at SIUC; however, this may not always be the cause. The resolution will be voted upon at the next meeting.

9. **Faculty Senate – Professor Howze**

One of the members of the Faculty Senate's executive committee has asked to take a look at the budget for Athletics, ORDA, Institutional Advancement and all Centers. Our members posed a very relative question as to why are they not self-sufficient? He explained to the Chancellor at one of the forums he had attended recently that we do not see this as a planning process to be determined at some point. There are 117 days to go until July 1 and everybody has their own private concerns as to whether they can make it if they have to go without a paycheck. We have already spoken in our capacities to please not spring it on the faculty at the last minute.

10. **Nominations to Committees – Professor Mundschenk**

No report

11. **GPSC Report – Gargi Bhattacharya**

No report.

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

No report

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

Professor Kittleson reported that the Committee has completed 14 of 23 reviews, both internal and external. He expressed his appreciation to the members of the Graduate Council involved in this process and others who volunteered to represent the Graduate Council on these reviews. He added that all reviews will be completed within the next month or two.

14. **Report of Ed Policies Committee – Professor McClurg**

No report.

15. **Old Business**

There was no new business to report.

16. **New Business**

There was no new business to report.

There being no further business to bring before the Council, a motion for adjournment was made by Professor McClurg and seconded by Professor Hurlburt. The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted

Donna L. Reynolds
Recording Secretary

“