

Minutes of the Graduate Council
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
October 7, 2010

Members and Administrative Officers:

Present: Amer AbuGhazaleh, Gary Apgar, Sara Baer, David Carlson, Rita Cheng, Judith Davie, Michelle Hook Dewey (GPSC), Susan Ford, Claudette Henderson (GPSC), Nicholas Hoffman (GPSC), Jody Huggenvik, Holly Hurlburt, Scott Ishman, Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, Mark Kittleson, John A. Koropchak, Leslie Lloyd, Shauna MacDonald (GPSC), Matthew McCaroll, Paul McGreal, Jay Means, Eileen Meehan (Ryan Netzley), Manoj Mohanty, Joe Moore (GPSC), Nancy Mundschenk, Ryan Netzley, Mark Peterson, Don Rice, Prudence Rice, Keith Waugh, Matthew Whiles, David Wilson, Tomasz Wiltowski (Manoj Mohanty) and Bryan Young.

Absent: Najjar Abdul-Musawwir, John Dobbins, John Mead, Elyse Pineau, and Pamela Smoot.

In Attendance: William Stevens, AP Representative and Tina M. Price, Recording Secretary

Proceedings:

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

Announcement of Proxies:

Dr. Wilson announced that Dr. Manoj Mohanty will proxy for Dr. Tomasz Wiltowski and Ryan Netzley will proxy for Eileen Meehan.

1. Consideration of Minutes of the September 2, 2010 Graduate Council Meeting.

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

2. Remarks—Chancellor Rita Cheng

Chancellor Cheng thanked the members for attending the Chancellor's address. She reiterated some of the key points during discussions in the summer months with the SIUC Graduate Council, as well as discussions with the Executive Council:

- We are getting considerable coverage in our changes in enrollment management as it relates to undergraduate recruitment.
- We have changed our staffing, structure, and are working intensely on messaging and marketing.
- We are working to clean up the campus for perspective student and family visits.

Chancellor Cheng advised that for the short term the university is looking at factors that students and families take into consideration when choosing schools, and its impact for rejecting a school. She stated that this will be accomplished through research and surveying students in addition to looking at the national data.

The long term message focused on:

- Changing to a stronger message about our distinctive programs.
- Identifying the reasons we are distinct from other institutions.
- With the right messaging on cost, debunk the myth that it is too expensive to attend SIUC. Results of analyses on cost have shown that we are not more expensive than some of the competitors.
- Focused attention on workshops coordinated by Dr. Jim Allen on assessment on student learning outcomes and teaching effectiveness, which will factor into the look of the core curriculum and the work that we need to do in our gateway courses.
- Ensure that students we do accept are successful because enrollment is connected to access, particularly at the freshman level.
- Ensure that students that are here stay here, and matriculate through their sophomore, junior and senior year.
- Focus attention on international students, particularly at the graduate levels, through visits to secure our relationships with long standing affiliates in Taiwan and China.
- Continue to work with Iraqi government officials on a student pipeline.

Chancellor Cheng advised the council members that the Higher Learning Commission self-study and team report may now be accessed on the accreditation website (<http://www.ope.ed.gov/accreditation/>).

Budget discussions with the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) and the legislative level are scheduled to start within the next couple of weeks, possibly into November. The Chancellor hoped that state appropriations remain the same. She advised that these are serious discussions about reapportionments, as rewards have gone to those that are “successful.”

Chancellor Cheng stated that the campus is moving forward in a productive way, and we are strong. While the budget situation in FY12 is not likely to be better than it has been this year (FY11), we are really looking at some short term solutions right now, specifically:

- Hiring freezes and not spending OTF dollars.
- Making unpaid administrative leave proposals, and working through that.
- With a structural deficit of about \$5.6 million, the need to address that through enrollment growth.

There has been a focus on undergraduates because that is a huge subsidy to everything else we do, along with graduate tuition. We will be working through those the longer term. The other longer term issue is to focus on the state; that indeed they have been under funding our research institution.

Chancellor Cheng encouraged everyone to take advantage of the opportunity to interact with the approximately seven thousand homecoming visitors and alums expected this weekend.

In response to Dr. Mohanty's question regarding comparisons of university tuition rates publish by *College Data*, the Chancellor stated that comparisons were conducted for SIUC, SEMO and Murray State. It was found that the total cost to go to school is only about a \$1,000 difference. She expressed a concern since parents are looking at that publication, and she planned to examine the reported comparisons.

With regard to tuition, the council members were reminded that there is a need for new money in order to keep up with the cost of living. She proposed looking at the value composition:

- What is it about SIUC that is very different from Murray State or SEMO?
- There is not a lot of cross over. There are not very many students who apply here and do not attend, but attend SEMO or Murray State. So, students are choosing those other institutions and not even considering SIUC.
- There is a more level playing field if we look at the financial aid package.

The Chair interjected stating that there are a couple of items that may be of interest to the council members; the Chancellor's scheduled tours of the research labs; and a Request For Proposal (RFP) going out that looks at housing for all students, particularly for graduate students.

In response to discussions about tuition and competition, Professor Ford drew attention to the missed opportunities to market what SIUC has to offer in advertisements:

- Promote SIUC as a research institution offering a world class education that students cannot get at any of those other institutions.
- Classes with world class scholars and top level researchers.
- Interviews with a freshman or sophomore in these classes who have had their world transformed and cannot wait to have more classes
- Offer something really unique in southern Illinois, more than just general education classes.

After a brief discussion, The Chancellor concurred with the need to shift from the beauty of the area and the opportunities for nonacademic social life on campus. She expressed an interest in Professor Ford's feedback on marketing and the image conveyed as we move forward.

Dr. Koropchak interjected that the Lipman Hearne group is providing feedback on SIUC marketing efforts. They reported an overall assessment indicating that there is a need to market more from our academics and research side of the university.

And Professor Ford, we also do need to sort out how we differentiate our graduate marketing, and don't do a lot of that. We market program by program. And is there a way through image and words that we can convey what you are suggesting. The images are being swapped out and I'll be interested in your feedback as we move forward.

Remarks—Interim Provost Don S. Rice

There were no additional remarks.

3. Announcements

Vice Chancellor for Research John A. Koropchak

Dr. Koropchak shared information regarding award data after the first quarter, the first three months of the year:

- We are at approximately the same levels we were last fiscal year.
- FY10 awards data is not yet finalized, but we will be significantly higher than the number previously recorded; \$73 Million was discussed, but we are currently at over \$77 million over last fiscal year.

Final data indicated that graduate enrollment for fall 2010 rose 2.7% (111 students). The final head count was 4,162 graduate students this fall.

There have been discussions in recent years about how the complexion of our graduate students has been changing in terms of distribution of Master's versus PhD students. In the early 2000's, the fraction of our graduate students that were in doctoral programs was about 21% or 22%. This has been steadily increasing, up to 29% for the fall of 2009 and this fall 30% of our graduate students now are doctoral students. Dr. Koropchak stated that one way to interpret these data is that as we enhance the reputation of the university in terms of our research portfolio, the fraction of the most serious doctoral students will be increasing.

The Graduate Enrollment Working Group, represented by all the colleges, and is working on plans for continued growth. Ideas will be shared with this group later.

Dr. Koropchak reported that the National Research Council (NRC) has finally released their data and the ranking of doctoral programs. Documentation from the magazine *Nature* was distributed to the council members. He referred to the headline, *US School Ranking Needs No winners* as a reasonable way to look at these data.

NRC last ranked doctoral programs in 1994, in which every program had a number assigned to it. This year there are many numbers assigned to each program, with several categories of rankings. We had 21 programs ranked, and there were 212 universities nation-wide that participated: Note that out of roughly 4500 institutions of higher learning only ~200 have doctoral programs.

Dr. Koropchak directed attention to the NRC Rankings of SIU Programs (by Percentile) handout, specifically, Regression Based, Survey Based, overall Program Quality rankings; and also the measures of Faculty Research Activity, Student Support/Outcome, and finally Faculty Student/Diversity. In addition, beneath every category, there are two different measures; 5th percentile and 95th percentile. The way these were determined is that the 5th percentile rankings, the data for the top five percent programs were eliminated and then NRC recalculated the rankings. On the other hand for the 95th percentile, the data for the five percent that were lowest were eliminated and the rankings were recalculated.

The 5th percentile might be described as the optimist perspective and the 95th percentile might be the pessimistic perspective of the doctoral program ranking. So what that means

is that basically there is a range for every measure. The NRC is basically saying that they have a 90% confidence that the program will lie somewhere within that range.

Dr. Koropchak stated that a lot of our programs overall tend to be somewhere in the second and third quartile. He added that the last time the NRC did the rankings, we had a program in the 2nd quartile and a couple in the 3rd, with virtually all the others the 4th quartile.

After a brief discussion, it was reiterated that NRC last collected data in 1994 and published it in 1995.

Dr. Koropchak continued with an overview of the rankings, stating that our programs ranked particularly highly in Student Support/Outcomes, including timely-to-degree and outcomes, which goes to the core of what this institution is about. We are a major research institution, but at the same time students are always at the core and the center of what we do. Further, many programs are ranked highly for Faculty/Student Diversity. At the same time we have some programs that are ranked very highly overall amongst the most prestigious programs in the country. Having nationally competitive programs that provide a nurturing environment for student success is a powerful statement to make about SIUC.

He stated that the database can be accessed from the website and the spreadsheet for NRC. There are some cases where SIUC is located often above and below either highly prestigious private institutions or flagship institutions. In the middle you have a non-flagship institution. It is eye opening to see some examples like that.

The Chancellor interjected that there is an interactive tool where you can select SIUC and also select other institutions to compare programs. So, a program specific analysis would be useful to faculty for all these dimensions, and they have bar charts.

Dr. Wilson added that the Chronicle of Higher Education has come up with their own version of access, and NRC's data is fully accessible.

Dr. Koropchak briefly discussed plans for workshops using simplified data sets to help programs interpret the data in ways that can allow programs to improve. Stating that the idea that we have programs that are so highly ranked in terms of student support and outcome, at the same time highly ranked overall, sends a powerful message that, he as an academician at this university feels particularly proud of.

Dr. Wilson addressed the selection process stating that the taxonomy that the NRC put together was very complicated. They included 20 additional areas, from about 50 or so that they had included in the previous ranking system.

The first thing we decided was how we were going to handle programs that are eligible to participate because it was up to the institution whether or not to include them. We decided to include everybody that met eligibility requirements.

There were special problems regarding Engineering. We collected the data in 2005-2006; we had a PhD program in Engineering Science that fit nowhere in the taxonomy. After

speaking with NRC to explain that we had a program with four very strong and separate concentrations, we agreed to run them as a concentration, a standalone program, and that is why it is set up the way it is. There are four concentrations, but the mining engineering concentration is not included because it is too small. They had to have produced five doctoral students within the past five years to have been included in the study. Physics was a program that had just started and was not at a point where they could be included. And then of course you get the taxonomy of two programs in the college of science that are listed under agriculture. So, that just happens to be the way they set this up.

Dr. Koropchak stated that the Agriculture PhD was not included because it was too new by NRC criteria.

Dr. Wilson added that Environmental Resources and Policy (ER&P) barely made it. We decided to go ahead because we were not going to protect anybody. They did quite well and should be very pleased given that they are literally a new program.

Dr. Kittleson asked whether these were the only listings that we had programs in or did the NRC just include additional ones? Dr. Wilson responded that there were a lot more, but these were programs we had that fit. They excluded Education and Business. There were discussions about the Rehabilitation programs with the NRC and ultimately they elected not to include them. After a brief discussion, it was noted that a national study on Education would be cost prohibitive. Even so, a study on Education is under consideration.

Further discussions ensued regarding the support Dr. Wilson received from David Owen, a doctoral student who helped with the long data collection process and explaining the complicated S and R rankings. The faculty was forced to put things in certain categories. The S rankings are faculty driven, so the S rankings are more peer based. The R rankings were more data driven. David Owen worked extensively with the NRC and now Mathematica, which is the group NRC contracted to do these various calculations.

Dr. Wilson stated that the NRC tried to figure out a way to eliminate the branding aspect of rankings. In other words, you got a high ranking because everybody thought you should have a high ranking. So the way they did this, statistically, is to try to eliminate the branding factor. Now they will not say that, but they will say they have done this in such a way that all programs are on an equal footing. The people who are very upset about this are not the people at Southern Illinois University.

In 1995, the programs that were in the 1st quartile, they were all programs that had more than 30 faculty members. If you look at the 2nd quartile, there was only one program that had less than 30 faculty members. You cannot compete in that environment.

Dr. Koropchak added that if you go through some of these lists of the other institutions, there is a measure of program size. And in many of our cases you will see that all the programs around us are largest size, and we are there in moderate to small size and still competing with them in terms of overall productivity.

Dr. Wilson continued stating that he did not think that the study would ever be released because it went on for so long. And you can argue that the data is so stale, that it is not as

useful as it might have been if it had been released two or three years ago. They had some serious problems with the methodology; working out this R and S problem, which I think took them an additional two years just to figure out how to do it. They ran each of these calculations 500 times for each of the criteria through a very sophisticated sampling system called halving.

Professor Ford addressed the following areas of concern regarding the study:

- The timely request for data
- Addressing disciplines other than the humanities
- Referencing general articles and not reviewing books and chapters
- The top programs have 40-50 percent of their faculty in medical and ecology, none in social sciences
- Bias in the way the rankings are curved, particularly in some of the social sciences that are book-oriented.

Dr. Wilson stated he believed they did capture books, but it was book chapters they did not. Professor Ford stated the website was point specific that they only used books for the humanities, and other areas they only used books were peer reviewed general articles for the sciences. The Chancellor added that it does serve a purpose: engaged discussion in the departments and looking at other programs and where they are ranked in different categories. So it is much better than the old here is a list, and you might not know where to compare.

Dr. Koropchak reported that his office and the Provost have subscribed to an extensive service called Academic Analytics. It compliments and goes beyond the NRC study, and it does include data for business and education. We will be providing training programs where you can look at any institution, set of institutions, books total or books per FTE.

Interim Provost Rice stated that Academic Analytics is going to be a very nice tool when combined with what is available from NRC. Academic Analytics will give a comparison with other institutions, and you select the institutions according to whatever parameters of interest. It will give you a comparison of books of various measures, of research productivity other than various books of service-oriented activities and so on. And then they have a tool which is called a productivity flower which graphically takes it apart and give you measures on any variables you want, and the higher you rank in those variables the longer the petal. So, you get a circular visualization which looks like a closed flower when you are more abundant.

The Chancellor stated this is just a visual of our activity, which of these variables we think is important and how we are doing with the factors that accurately represents our programs. Dr. Koropchak added that if you look at some of the programs that we aspire to be like, how do they differ? This data can be very valuable not only from a marketing perspective but as well from a strategic planning perspective.

Further discussions ensued regarding the capabilities of Academic Analytics, tackle the challenge of capturing book chapters and sophisticated tools to capture grant related data at the federal level.

In response to a question, he stated that 2005-2006 was when the NRC data was collected.

Dr. Korpochak shared information on the Research Climate Survey. Last year the council proposed this idea and put it together with the goals to a) Assess the research climate on campus, and b) Identify ways to improve productivity, perhaps to assist the new Chancellor, and c) Address the undertone of discussion about academic balance. He stated that the council members had a copy of the report, and provided the following observations:

- 34% response rate; considered very good.
- From our standpoint of funded researchers, the response rate was lower than we would have hoped; 68% of those responding are not funded researchers.
- Academic balance was part of the discussions. The overall conclusion based on these responses was, generally, the faculty thought that the institution has the right balance toward teaching and research. There is a sense that is maybe somewhat less so from administration, but overall the general climate for research on the campus is that it is positive and it is valued. In that respect, the report is kind of “vanilla” in interpretation.
- In terms of ways to improve, the one motivating factor that will have greatest impact on increasing research productivity would be more release time for faculty to do so, and also more assistance for research at the college and departmental levels.
- With regard to comments about ORDA, there are two things that we will take advantage of: There is an internal audit underway right now that may provide some more guidance. We will plan on organizing a group of faculty, maybe the Research Committee of Graduate Council or other faculty and staff, to have a working group that will address some of the issues that were raised in those comments.

In response to a question, Dr. Koropchak stated that 68% of the responses came from unfunded faculty.

The Chancellor addressed whether it is possible to sort through these responses and get perceptions other than non-funded faculty responses, particularly as it relates to ORDA. There must have been an indication there, if they responded with a yes or no, which can just be divided; take a look at what the responses are and run the analysis with the divide.

Dr. Koropchak stated he will see if they can do that.

The Chancellor addressed the reporting that faculty members were motivated in terms of research. The respondents said that they were motivated extrinsically; that is a measure of the climate here. It is a research environment because that is what people do here, that is who they are and that is their professional identity.

Dr. Koropchak reported briefly that there has been a \$50,000 endowment established for Dr. Willis Swartz, the first dean of the graduate school. The proceeds will go to support new graduate students, with preference to new international students and students working in the area of materials. This is largely the result of the efforts of the group called

the Chinese Students of 1957 and spearheaded by the friends of Ju Wah Chen and his wife Harlin. So if you happen to see them, please thank them. Dr. Koropchak hoped this is the start of something we can build into something much more substantial.

Dr. Koropchak also mentioned the Technology Expo is scheduled for tomorrow, October 8 in the Dunn Richmond Center from 9:00 am to 4:30 pm. There is a luncheon and reception, as well presentations by members of our faculty and some external speakers. We hope that you can participate in that.

Associate Vice Chancellor Prudence Rice

The Chair interjected stating that she attended the Board of Trustees Meeting in Edwardsville, and it was the SIUE opportunity to showcase. After a very slick presentation of their undergraduate research, a trustee member stated that they certainly hope the Carbondale campus will do the same. Chancellor Cheng responded to the trustee member that SIUC has, in fact, an undergraduate research program. The Chair asked Dr. Rice to reiterate the undergraduate research program to the Graduate Council.

Dr. Rice stated that we have done that and it is a good opportunity to do it again at the next Board of Trustees meeting in Carbondale.

Dr. Koropchak concluded with a statement that this goes back to the NRC. We have the most extensive portfolio of undergraduate research opportunities that you will find at any university in the country. But at the same time, we have the faculty here who give the effort and pay more attention to that and that is demonstrated in the rankings, doctoral student rankings, where Student Support/Outcomes are a particular strength. He stated that is a testament to commitment. All of you and all of your colleagues should be proud of what you do with students at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Associate Dean David L. Wilson

Dr. Wilson reported that the Apply Yourself application is working even better than we hoped. When we go through the admission process, we are finding it is incredibly expedited from our old system. The admissions staff commented that the process took less than an hour to admit an international student. There are more than 300 applications now, when normally there would be none at this point.

The Chancellor interjected with feedback that was given by Lipman Hearne: "You have a great amount of promise here. You have 20,000 students despite what you are doing here." She stated that the application process is a very good example of that, and that the future is bright.

On behalf of the Dean's Council, Dr. Koropchak reported that the deans would like to have more discussions regarding the NRC survey. There are plans to report back to the Graduate Council with that in time.

4. Announcements – Chairman Mundschenk

The theme of the inauguration has been set at *Advancing a Culture of Excellence*. Chairman Mundschenk deferred to Professor Mark Kittleson.

Professor Kittleson announced that he had accepted a job at New Mexico State as Department Chair of Public Health Sciences and will be leaving SIU January 1. The Chair wished him well, but was certainly sad to see him go. She complimented his committee and expressed appreciation for their work.

5. Faculty Senate—Professor Gary Apgar

The senate will be meeting next Tuesday, October 12. Professor Apgar stated that the listserv put out an invitation for the Fall Faculty Meeting which will be October 21. There will be an Italian buffet with a panel discussion centered on budgetary issues. The council members were encouraged to attend.

6. Report from CPBAC—Professor Ishman

Professor Ishman reported that there were discussions regarding enrollment numbers, the furlough or unpaid administrative leave plan and on decision factors to be considered. A subcommittee was formed to discuss differential budget cuts and how those will be made in the future. He stated until more of that is ironed out, they will wait to present factors.

7. Nominations to Committees—Professor Ishman

Professor Ishman reported that Dr. Tomasz Wiltowski was nominated for the position of representative for the Outstanding Scholar Committee.

Graduate Council was asked to provide several names to the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Engineering search committees. Judith Davie and Holly Hurlburt were put forward for Liberal Arts. Prudence Rice and David Wilson were provided for Engineering.

8. GPSC Report- Shauna MacDonald

Shauna MacDonald reported that they have been working on internal policy, constituency and getting membership numbers up. Following a brief discussion regarding access to email addresses for the purposes of recruitment, she asked for ideas on how to reach more graduate students. There is an approved budget for this year, and they are ready to move forward.

9. Provost Search Committee—Professor Ford

Professor Ford reported that five candidates will be coming to campus starting at the end of this month. She confirmed that notification had been sent out, and that members of the Graduate Council and Senate have been invited to attend receptions to meet the candidates. The first one is Monday, October 18.

In response to a question regarding the number of applicants, the Chancellor stated that four were secured. She added that there was a good pool and they are still in conversation.

10. Report of Research Committee—Professor Baer

Professor Baer reported that they met and brainstormed ideas, thoughts and challenges the Research Committee could address. She stated that a list was brought to the executive committee for further discussions and prioritized to three topics to explore:

- Opportunity for promotional ranks beyond full professor. Last year we looked at our peer and aspirational institutions to see what they had done.
- Potential utility of some kind of research, scholarly activity, administrative advancement, associate dean position within each college to facilitate and lead the development of scholarship and provide additional infrastructure for proposals.
- The opportunity or potential for university wide differential flexible effort assignments among research, teaching and service. Some of the departments on campus already do this, and so we are going to look within our own university and also outside.

The council members were asked to present any comments or ideas for the committee.

11. Report of New Programs Committee—Professor Hurlburt

Professor Hurlburt reported that the committee met concerning the PhD proposal from the Department of Criminology; proposal will be brought forward in November. Regarding a second proposal concerning the Master's of Art Program from Art and Design, the committee will meet and discuss that this month.

As part of the larger discussions about surveys and research, the executive council decided that new programs should look in the direction of graduate programs online. The long term task for the year will be gathering information. Professor Hurlburt stated that the best bet is to gather information about what other departments on campus are thinking about education online and also what our peers and aspirational peers are doing.

Dr. Wilson stated that when we start talking about online programs, we will have to look at how we define graduate faculty status for the purposes of those programs.

Dr. Koropchak added that it will be good to have your group working along with the graduate enrollment group as well as other groups who have distance issues.

12. Report of Program Review Committee—Professor Kittleson

Professor Kittleson reported that the group is processing well. They have gone through Dr. Allen's assessment workshop, which lasted a few days. He offered thanks and appreciation to the people who have been involved in addition to those who have volunteered to serve as the Graduate Council representative.

Professor Kittleson hoped to have their reviews done by the end of the semester. An email will be sent to all the representatives asking them for a half page to three-quarters page review on their thoughts on this process.

There were discussions last year whether the internal/external reports should be posted online. That has not been resolved. He stated it would be interesting to get a quick synopsis from the participants of their observation. Those would then be shared amongst all the members of the Graduate Council.

13. Report of Education Policies Committee—Professor Ford

Professor Ford reported that the Executive Expanded Committee met on September 29 and completed a summary of concerns regarding the Draft University Code of Conduct and the Draft University Code of Ethics. She stated the committee was informed that these two codes were developed by and distributed from the President's office to the campus with a request to "comment and respond." Copies of the summaries were distributed to the Graduate Council members for review and discussion.

She stated that they were very concerned and stipulated those concerns with each of the items within that particular code, in addition to examples of situations that could create problems in everyday occurrences. The council members were also asked to review the codes and respond back to the committee if they shared in these concerns.

Professor Ford noted that the committee had fewer concerns with the Code of Conduct, except that most of the language was fairly boiler plate, and they were not sure why it was necessary since it was a repeat of a variety of legal requirements on research and teaching that already exist.

The major concern was the draft Code of Ethics. Unlike the existing Code of Ethics, it not only addressed behaviors but also attitudes. It was determined by the committee that this left open a huge back doorway to introduce collegiality for tenure and for promotion decisions. And if this code of ethics is adopted, there is a requirement to report any perceived violation of this code up the ladder. This was interpreted to mean that if an individual were not nice to someone in the hallway that that could end up on the president's desk within a week, if the rules were followed.

Professor Ford reported that the committee did not bring forth any recommendations. She requested direction from the Graduate Council on how to best address their concerns.

Dr. Rice stated that if this came from the President's office, it came from risk management and legal counsel. And that the Graduate Council needs to be aware that they are increasingly developing policies, or codes in this case, that are particularly responsive to issues of risk management, that risk management is increasingly driving academic policy, and that there is a need to look very closely at what Professor Ford and her committee has done, at the kinds of things that are coming out and whether they are something that can realistically be implemented.

Professor Ford asked the Graduate Council whether the committee needed to simply bring a recommendation to the Graduate Council now to support these documents or to send

the concerns to a particular office and request more information, or if they act, to what office would she send those concerns?

Interim Provost Rice stated that his recommendation would be, whichever is the best course of action, to convey it to Dr. Koropchak and let him convey that to the Chancellor and it go from the Chancellor to the Vice President's office.

In the ensuing discussions, Professor Ford proposed to prepare comments for Dr. Koropchak in about two weeks. That would give everybody wishing to review the documents an opportunity to look at the concerns that the committee raised and add anything to that. Dr. Wilson advised Professor Ford that the resolution must be on the agenda before a vote. It was further advised that a resolution saying that this is unacceptable would be more effective than just a resolution expressing concerns. Dr. Koropchak inquired whether the council accepts the feedback from the committee as being representative of the Graduate Council. He clarified that the point is whether the Graduate Council as a whole wanted to see that response before it is forwarded.

With respect to procedures, the Chair asked that the committee generate a resolution to be placed on the agenda and at the next meeting have a discussion as to whether or not that is an acceptable resolution, offer a friendly delete or amend it, and then vote on it at that time.

14. Old Business:

The council members congratulated Dean David Carlson for receiving the 2010 Illinois Academic Librarian of the Year award.

15. New Business:

No report.

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Attachments:

National Research Council's Rankings of SIU Programs (by Percentile)
US school ranking names no winners. Nature, Vol. 467, September 30, 2010
Graduate Council—Educational Policies Committee

Respectfully Submitted,

Tina M. Price
Recording Secretary