The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was called to order at 2:30pm on Thursday, March 28, 2019 in the Board Room of the Morris University Center by President-Elect DeGroot-Brown.

Present: Jocelyn DeGroot-Brown, Marcus Agustin, Shadrack Msengi, Laurie Rice, Wai Cheah, Dan Segrist
Excused: Sorin Nastasia, Ed Navarre
Absent: None
Guests: Tom Jordan, Nancy Lutz (UPBC), Eric Ruckh

Guest Speakers:
Tom Jordan shared information on changes to University Policies 1Q5 (Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research and Academic Misconduct) and 1Q9 (Conflicts of Interest and Commitment).

1Q5 has been completely redone and will completely replace the existing policy. The document now meets all Public Health Service (PHS) requirements. It has been reviewed by ERP, Grad Council, and the Policy Council. The floor was opened to questions. PHS has higher standards than NHS and is distributed broadly across agencies, however individual agencies can create rules that are not cross-agency.

1Q9 was modified after an internal audit finding that the Graduate School had no regular review process for policies. Some of the changes are due to outdated information. There are minor updates to language, phrasing, and some streamlining. This is a policy that allows the University to stay in compliance with state statutes, and it is often in the reduction of intellectual property that the policy comes into play. The floor was opened to questions. The policy will be presented to the Faculty Senate for an informational review.

Honors Program Director Eric Ruckh provided a handout sharing information about the Honors Program; it is attached. Next year will be the fourth level, and they are on track to arrive at the targets for the new program. The distribution by unit as presented in the handout was reviewed, and it was noted that Dental students are counted as part of Biology because of the way the program is structured. There are rough comparisons to the racial and ethnic distribution of the University as a whole, but they have been intentionally working at diversifying the makeup of the program.

The budget for the Honors Program has been increasing, and they also received the Chancellor’s Innovation Grant for FY19. They are currently hiring for an Assistant Director who they plan to have in place by Summer. The grant has goals that the new Assistant Director will need to meet. A budget increase was requested for next year due to the growing curriculum. There are some faculty teaching a
1 credit hour overload to teach pro seminars, but the base rate will change depending on the bargaining unit contract. Much of the focus over the past year has been on increasing funding, and the numbers are close to what was presented to Faculty Senate when the program was created.

The curriculum has developed from 6 course in AY13/14 to 51 in AY18/19. Changes are being communicated better among the faculty participating, but it is barely sustainable in terms of scheduling in the current state. He has met with faculty one-on-one to talk about the program, and it has been fruitful. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are generally the ones teaching in these programs at other institutions, but SIUE has had people teaching at the 121 level who are adjuncts that have demonstrated commitment and dedication. If departments have exceptional instructors they want to provide opportunities to, it is something the program can consider.

It was necessary to increase centralization into the Honors Office, and many of the problems they were encountering before have virtually been eliminated. The program does peer-to-peer teaching observations, and they are continuing to encourage and expand that to make it normative behavior for the program.

The Honors Program has not graduated students, so there are some things they cannot do yet. They have looked at students who could have been in the program but chose not to enter the program, and while there are correlations it is not causation. When they are able to evaluate the program more precisely they can understand what is working. They are trying to build a curricular and a co-curricular program.

There were over 25 applicants for the Assistant Director position, and 12 were chosen for Skype interviews. Finalists will be brought to campus, which will be determined soon.

The assessment for the Honors Program must be finalized this year. It will be brought to the Faculty Senate throughout the year to work through it, and the goal is to have it approved by the Senate by the end of next academic year. It will be put on a regular assessment schedule after that.

At the time of the revamp, an advisory council was needed and functions as a quasi School faculty. Now that the program is functional, it is harder to see the functions without developed papers and structure. The Honors Program increasingly impacts other areas on campus and needs to be integrated into the governing structure of the Faculty Senate. There are different possibilities on how that can happen. In regards to staffing the program, it extremely hard to support the faculty ad hoc. It is not sustainable in the current form, and there is a need to establish affiliations to create pools of people available.

To become an actual Honors College for the University, there is a threshold of 600. If the infrastructure is in place, it is very close to being able to support it. Admissions has started to see the value of the Honors Program, and they are asking how soon it can grow beyond current numbers.

The floor was opened to questions.
There was discussion on the benefits and challenges of taking the program forward as a College. The infrastructure and administrative support is not in place right now, and it seems early to pursue since it has not yet been evaluated. It was acknowledged that there needs to be some kind of bridge strategy to help get past the AY21/22 assessment at the current scale of the program. Pathways are being laid down with Deans as they have had repeat faculty participating, and there is interest in the pro seminars.

The program has been relying on existing faculty and students to talk about it and share information about the program. People are becoming more aware, but there was also discussion on the potential of people wanting to participate but being unable to because of diminished resources in departments.

The Honors Advisory Council is composed of various schools and students, and there was a discussion on what it would take to integrate it into the Faculty Senate. There was general agreement that the easiest route would be through the Curriculum Council.

**Announcements:**
Announcements were reviewed as listed on the agenda.

**Consideration of Minutes:**
The minutes for the February 14, 2019 meeting were approved as written.

**Unfinished Business:**
There was no unfinished business.

**New Business:**
Discussion of FSEC support for and feedback to the Diversity Council’s proposed Professional Development Policy was tabled until the next meeting.

Cheah received the data for the Chancellor’s and Provost’s annual evaluation, and the committee is working on the report. It will likely be presented at the May meeting.

Changes to the Curriculum Council Operating Papers was presented. There were two major changes that do not show as track changes. The minimum number of members for the Council was changed to 9-12, and there was a section related to the Provost Office that was removed in agreement with the Provost Office. It will be presented to the Faculty Senate for a first reading in April.

**Reports:**
The UPBC meets tomorrow. The second round of Innovation Grants will be coming in April. Ann Popkess will be taking over as Chair-Delegate so someone will need to be selected to serve out the rest of her term, and potential appointment changes will be brought forward as a package in May.

The FDC reported that the Continuous Improvement Conference takes place tomorrow and Teaching Excellence Award letters have been sent out.
Curriculum Council heard the program review for Liberal Studies and decided that the program is in good standing and the numbers are sustainable, but if the numbers go up they will need additional resources. Marc Ortegren was approved as the replacement for Linda Lovata on the Graduation Appeals Committee. Enrollment Management announced that Fall undergraduate admits are up 4.5%.

Welfare Council submitted a written report on SharePoint and is attached.

There were no other reports.

**Public Comment:**
There was no public comment.

**Adjournment:**
The meeting adjourned at 3:59pm.

Submitted by Anne Hunter, University Governance
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Board Room, Morris University Center
March 28, 2019 – 2:30 p.m.
AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. GUEST SPEAKERS
   a. Honors Program Director Eric Ruckh

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Faculty Senate meetings, Spring 2019, guest speakers:
      i. April 4 - full Faculty Senate meeting (2:30 p.m., Mississippi Illinois Rooms in
         Morris University Center): Honors Program Director Eric Ruckh
      ii. May 2 - full Faculty Senate meeting (2:30 p.m., Mississippi Illinois Rooms in
         Morris University Center): Lakesha Butler, Black Faculty and Staff Association
         President
   b. Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings, Spring 2019, guest speakers:
      i. April 11 - Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting (2:30 p.m., Magnolia
         Room in Morris University Center): Provost Denise Cobb and Assistant Provost
         Jessica Harris
      ii. April 25 - Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting (2:30 p.m., Magnolia
         Room in Morris University Center): Associate Chancellor for Institutional
         Diversity and Inclusion Venessa Brown; Jonathan Bean (rescheduled, tentative
         pending health update)
      iii. May 9 – Chancellor Randy Pembrook
   c. BOT meetings:
      i. March 28 – Springfield
      ii. May 16 – SIUC
      iii. July 18 – Springfield
   d. Information about policy changes
      i. Revised version of University Policy 1Q5 (Tom Jordan will be present at 2:30
         p.m. to provide any needed explanations)
      ii. Revised version of University Policy 1Q9 (Tom Jordan will be present at 2:30
         p.m. to provide any needed explanations)

IV. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
   a. February 14, 2019

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS
   a. FSEC support for and feedback to the Diversity Council’s proposed Professional
      Development Policy
   b. Chancellor’s and Provost’s annual evaluation
   c. Changes to Curriculum Council Operating Papers
VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL CHAIRS
   a. UPBC – Nancy Lutz
   b. Faculty Development Council – Shadrack Msengi
   c. Curriculum Council – Laurie Rice
   d. Rules & Procedures Council – Wai Cheah
   e. Welfare Council – Dan Segrist
   f. Graduate Council – Ed Navarre
   g. Past-President – Marcus Agustin
   h. President-Elect – Jocelyn DeGroot
   i. President – Sorin Nastasia

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The next FSEC meeting will be Thursday, April 11, 2019 at 2:30 p.m. in the Magnolia Room, Morris University Center
Replace all of the current Policy IQS with the following, including the title change

Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research and Academic Misconduct – IQS

I. Introduction

A. Preamble

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville (SIUE) believes that a positive climate for the exchange of information among scholars is an important factor in the maintenance of professional standards of competence and responsibility. The encouragement of intellectual honesty at all levels within the academic community is the foundation that fosters such a climate, and therefore, SIUE does not condone or tolerate research or academic misconduct. This document articulates SIUE’s policy on academic integrity in scholarship and research and prescribes procedures for impartial investigation and fair resolution of allegations of misconduct.

In addition to meeting SIUE’s responsibilities under the Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct, SIUE is aware that many professional associations have ethical codes or guidelines for the conduct of research. SIUE personnel are expected to comply with all such standards. Violations of such standards are a matter of peer review and censure and may, in some instances, also become grounds for disciplinary action by SIUE.

B. Scope

This policy is intended to carry out SIUE’s responsibilities under the Public Health Service (PHS) Policies on Research Misconduct, 42 CFR Part 93, corresponding policies on research misconduct of other funding agencies, and any other conduct that seriously conflicts with accepted ethical standards in research and scholarship. This policy applies to all SIUE employees involved in funded or unfunded research, applications for federal funding, as well as scholarly and creative activities. Student academic misconduct shall be handled in accordance with Student Academic Code Policy 322 and Plagiarism Policy 116, except in cases where allegations against a student are directly related to a student’s participation in an externally-funded project from a sponsor, such as the Public Health Service (PHS), that requires following the research misconduct procedure outlined in this policy.

This policy does not apply to differences of opinion or interpretations, honest (unintentional or inadvertent) error, authorship or collaboration disputes, nor does it distinguish between funded and unfunded research, activities, except where it refers to specific agency requirements.

II. Definitions

Academic and Research Misconduct is defined by SIUE as:

- research or academic misconduct, which includes but is not limited to:
  - fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results;
  - plagiarism, breach of confidentiality with respect to unpublished material, violation of accepted standards regarding submission and publication of scholarly works, and other misrepresentations of originality;
- failure to comply with research regulations or requirements, including, but not limited to, those applying to human subjects, laboratory animals, biohazardous agents, and standards of safety, or
- any other conduct which seriously conflicts with accepted ethical standards in research and scholarship, including intentionally misleading or false reporting of credentials or other academically related information.

- Misconduct involves acts of deception and excludes differences of opinion or interpretation and honest (unintentional or inadvertent) error. Authorship disputes do not, in and of themselves, constitute misconduct.

Allegation means a disclosure of possible academic or research misconduct through any means of communication, written or oral, to an institutional official.

Committee on Research Integrity (CRI) means the standing committee that works in conjunction with the RIO to administer cases of alleged academic or research misconduct.

Complainant means a person who in good faith makes an allegation of academic or research misconduct.

Conflict of interest means financial, personal, or professional relationships that may compromise, or appear to compromise, an individual's decisions.

Deciding Official (DO) means the SIUE official who makes final determinations on allegations of academic and research misconduct and any institutional administrative actions. The DO will not be the same individual as the Research Integrity Officer and should have no direct prior involvement in SIUE's inquiry, investigation, or allegation assessment. A DO's appointment of an individual (1) to assess allegations of research misconduct or (2) to serve on an inquiry or investigation committee is not considered to be direct prior involvement. The DO for SIUE is the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Deputy Research Integrity Officer (DRCO) means the SIUE official responsible for: (1) assisting in the execution of the RIO's responsibilities and (2) serving as the RIO in the event the RIO is unavailable or has a conflict of interest. The DRCO for SIUE is the Associate Dean for Research. In the event the DRCO is unavailable or has a conflict of interest, a designee shall be appointed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Evidence means any document, tangible item, or testimony offered or obtained during a research or academic misconduct proceeding, including the research record, which tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact.

Fabrication means making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

Good faith means having a belief in the truth of one's statements such that a reasonable person in the same position could have, based on the information known to one at the time. A statement or allegation is not in good faith if made with the knowing or reckless disregard for information that would negate the allegation or statement.

Inquiry means preliminary information-gathering, fact-finding, and review to determine if the criteria for conducting a formal investigation of the alleged misconduct have been met. An Inquiry is not a formal hearing, it is designed to separate allegations deserving of further investigation from frivolous, unjustified, malicious, or deadly mistaken allegations.

Institutional member means a person who is employed by, is an agent of, or is affiliated by contract or agreement with SIUE. Institutional members may include, but are not limited to, officials, tenured and untenured faculty, teaching and support staff, researchers, research coordinators, clinical technicians, postdoctoral and other fellows, students, volunteers, agents and contractors, subcontractors, and subsubcontractors, and their employees.
Investigation is the formal development of a detailed, factual record and the examination of that record to determine if the alleged misconduct did or did not occur. If the investigation finds that misconduct did occur, the findings may include recommendations for further investigations, for other appropriate actions, including administrative actions, for appropriate sanctions.

Notice means a written communication served in person or sent by mail or its equivalent to the last known street address, facsimile number or e-mail address of the addressee. Notice will be deemed to be received upon personal delivery, one (1) day after deposit with express courier, upon confirmation of receipt of facsimile or e-mail or no receipt of error in delivery of the facsimile or email, or five (5) days after deposit in the mail.

Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit, including failing to put a quotation in quotation marks, or giving incorrect information about the source of a quotation.

Presumption of the evidence means proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not.

Research means a systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration, or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge (basic research) or specific knowledge (applied research). At SIUE “research” includes all scholarly and creative activities and publishing.

Research Integrity Inquiry Panel (RIIP) means the panel responsible for conducting an inquiry.

Research Integrity Officer (RIO) means the SIUE official responsible for: (1) assessing allegations of academic and research misconduct to determine if they fall within the definition of academic and research misconduct, are covered by 42 CFR Part 95, and warrant an inquiry on the basis that the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified; (2) overseeing inquiries and investigations; and (3) the other responsibilities described in this policy. The RIO for SIUE is the Associate Provost for Research.

Research record means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from academic and research inquiry, including, but not limited to, proposals, laboratory records, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, books or chapters in books, videos, tape recordings, photographs, databases, and any document and materials provided to an institutional official by a Respondent in the course of a misconduct proceeding.

Respondent means the person against whom an allegation of academic or research misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a misconduct proceeding.

Retaliation means, for the purpose of this policy, an adverse action taken against a complainant, witness, or committee member by SIUE or one of its institutional members in response to (a) a good faith allegation of academic or research misconduct or (b) good faith cooperation with an academic or research misconduct proceeding.

III. General Policies and Principles

A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct

All institutional members will report observed, suspected, or apparent research and academic misconduct to the RIO. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research or academic misconduct, they
may meet with or contact the RIO to discuss the suspected research or academic misconduct informally, which may include reporting it anonymously and/or discussing it hypothetically. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of research or academic misconduct, the RIO will refer the individual or allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem, if applicable.

At any time, an institutional member may have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible misconduct with the RIO and will be counseled about appropriate procedures for reporting allegations.

B. Cooperation with Research or Academic Misconduct Proceedings

Institutional members will cooperate with the RIO and other institutional officials in the review of allegations and the conduct of inquiries and investigations. SIUE institutional members, including respondents, have an obligation to provide evidence relevant to research or academic misconduct allegations to the RIO or other SIUE officials.

C. Confidentiality

All SIUE employees involved in administering this policy and its procedures are expected to make diligent efforts to protect the identities, academic reputations, positions, and rights of those who make good-faith allegations of academic misconduct and those who are the subject of such allegations. To the extent possible, SIUE shall maintain the identity of complainant and respondent in confidence and shall not disclose any identifying information or details of a misconduct proceeding or report, except:

i. to those who need to know in order to carry out a thorough, competent, objective, and fair misconduct proceeding;
ii. to funding agencies, as required by law, as they conduct a review of the misconduct proceeding and any subsequent proceedings; or
iii. as otherwise may be prescribed by applicable law.

The nature of the allegation and the evidence available will determine whether or not a case can be reviewed effectively without the involvement of complainant in the proceedings. Cases that depend specifically upon the observations or statements of complainant cannot proceed without the involvement of that individual; other cases that can rely on documentary evidence may permit complainant to remain anonymous.

To the extent possible, any information obtained during the misconduct proceeding that might identify the human subject(s) of research shall be maintained securely and confidentially and shall not be disclosed, except to those who need to know in order to carry out the misconduct proceedings.

The RIO may use mechanisms such as written confidentiality agreements as needed.

For breaches of confidentiality, SIUE may, as necessary, take administrative actions, including but not limited to disciplinary measures.

D. Interim Administrative Actions and Notifying ORI of Special Circumstances

Throughout the misconduct proceeding, the RIO will review the situation to determine if there is any threat of harm to public health, federal funds and equipment, or the integrity of the research process. In the event of such a threat, the RIO will, in consultation with other institutional officials and the U.S. Public Health Service’s Office of Research Integrity (ORI), if needed, take appropriate interim action to protect against any such threat. Interim action might include additional monitoring of the research process and the handling of federal funds and equipment, reassignment of personnel or of the responsibility for the handling of federal funds and equipment, additional review of research data and results or delaying publication. The RIO shall, at any time during a research or academic misconduct proceeding, notify, if needed, ORI or other relevant agency immediately if the RIO has reason to believe that any of the following conditions exist:
health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animals
- federal sponsor resources or interests are threatened
- research activities should be suspended
- a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law exist
- federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research or academic misconduct proceeding
- the misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and HHS or other agency action may be necessary to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved or
- the research community or public should be informed.

E. Advisers

The respondent and complainant may consult with their own legal counsel or a non-lawyer personal adviser (who may not be a principal or witness in the case) and, subject to the RIO's prior approval, bring the counsel or personal adviser to interviews or meetings on the case. When counsel or personal adviser is present at an inquiry or investigation committee interview or meeting, their activities will be limited to advising the complainant or respondent, as opposed to representing the complainant or respondent before the committee. The adviser or counsel may not direct questions to the committee other than simple requests for clarification.

All interviews conducted during the assessment, inquiry or investigation will be transcribed. Each interviewee will be provided with a copy of the transcript and given five (5) business days to review the transcript of their interview(s) for accuracy. Changes to the transcript are limited to factual errors. The final corrected versions of all transcripts will be part of the official record of the misconduct proceeding.

III. Responsibilities of the RIO and Appointment of the CRI

A. Responsibilities of the Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

The RIO will have primary responsibility for implementation of this policy. These responsibilities include the following duties.

- Consult confidentially with persons uncertain about whether to submit an allegation of academic or research misconduct.
- Receive allegations of academic and research misconduct.
- Assess each allegation of academic and research misconduct in accordance with this policy to determine whether it falls within the definition of research or academic misconduct and warrants an inquiry.
- As necessary, take interim action and notify PHS's Office of Research Integrity (ORI) or other sponsor of special circumstances, in accordance with this policy.
- Sequester research data and evidence pertinent to the allegation of research or academic misconduct in accordance with this policy and maintain it securely in accordance with this policy and applicable law and regulation.
- To the extent possible, provide confidentiality to those involved in the research or academic misconduct proceeding.
- Notify the respondent and provide opportunities for them to review/comment/respond to allegations, evidence,
and committee reports in accordance with this policy.

- Inform respondents, complainants, and witnesses of the procedural steps in the research or academic misconduct proceeding.
- Appoint the members of the Research Integrity Inquiry Panel ("RIIP") and the Committee on Research Integrity ("CRI"), ensure that the committee is properly staffed and that there is expertise appropriate to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the evidence.
- Determine whether each person involved in handling an allegation of research or academic misconduct has an unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflict of interest and take appropriate action, including referral to ensure that no person with such conflict is involved in the research or academic misconduct proceeding.
- Keep the DO and others who need to know apprised of the progress of the review of the allegation of research or academic misconduct.
- If applicable, notify and make reports to ORI as required by 42 CFR Part 93.
- Ensure that administrative actions taken by SIUE and ORI or other agency, if applicable, are enforced and take appropriate action to notify other involved parties, such as sponsors, law enforcement agencies, professional societies, and licensing boards of those actions.
- Maintain records of the research or academic misconduct proceeding and make them available to ORI or another relevant agency in accordance with this policy.

B. The Committee on Research Integrity (CRI)

The RIO shall appoint a standing committee of at least three (3) senior faculty members and one alternate faculty member from at least three schools/colleges to the CRI. Ad hoc voting members from within or without SIUE may be appointed by the RIO to ensure the membership of the CRI has the proper expertise during the research or academic misconduct proceeding. The RIO shall be a non-voting member of the CRI.

Appointments of the CRI members shall be for staggered three-year terms, which are renewable. The RIO will take into consideration a faculty member’s research portfolio, rank, expertise, and years of experience when appointing these individuals to the CRI.

For all allegations of academic or research misconduct that involve violations of federal or institutional rules and regulations governing the conduct of research involving human subjects, animals, or biohazardous materials, the Chair or designee of the relevant compliance committee (e.g., Institutional Review Board, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, or Institutional Biosafety Committee) will serve as a voting ex officio member of the RIIP and the CRI.

V. Conducting the Assessment and Inquiry

A. Assessment of Allegations

Upon receiving an allegation of research or academic misconduct, the RIO will immediately assess the allegation to determine whether it is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research or academic misconduct may be identified, whether it is within the jurisdictional criteria of 42 CFR § 93.102(b), and whether the allegation falls within the definition of research or academic misconduct in 42 CFR § 93.103 or SIUE policies. An inquiry must be conducted if any of these criteria are met.

The assessment period should be brief, preferably concluded within 5 business days. In conducting the assessment, the RIO need not interview the complainant, respondent, or other witnesses, or gather data beyond any that may have been submitted with the allegation, except as necessary to determine whether the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research or academic misconduct may be identified.

B. Initiation and Purpose of the Inquiry
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If the RIO determines that the criteria for an inquiry are met, they will immediately initiate the inquiry process. The purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the available evidence to determine whether to conduct an investigation. An inquiry does not require a full review of all the evidence related to the allegation.

C. Notice to Respondent; Initial Sequestration of Research Records; Admission

On or before the date on which the respondent is notified of the inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, the RIO must take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the inquiry or investigation, if applicable, inventory the records and evidence and sequester them in a secure manner; provided, however, that where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be linked to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments. Also, on or before the date on which the respondent is notified, the RIO shall notify the respondent’s department chair and the dean of the respondent’s school/college of all allegations of research misconduct and the initiation of the inquiry process.

At the time of or before beginning an inquiry, the RIO must make a good faith effort to notify the respondent in writing, if the respondent is known. The notice to respondent shall include the following:

- timeline for the inquiry
- a description of all allegations of research misconduct made against the respondent
- a copy of this policy
- the names of the CRI members and any ad hoc members.

The respondent shall have two (2) business days from receipt of the notice to raise concerns regarding any potential conflicts of interest. SIUE shall make the final determination of whether a conflict of interest exists and if a conflict of interest is found to exist, individuals who have a conflict of interest will not be permitted to participate in the inquiry or investigation, if applicable. If the inquiry subsequently identifies additional respondents, they must also be notified in writing.

D. Appointment of the Inquiry Committee

To initiate the inquiry process, the RIO will appoint a Research Integrity Inquiry Panel (RIIP). The RIIP shall consist of at least three (3) members: the RIO and two or more members of the CRI. The RIO will serve as a non-voting member of the RIIP. Ad ad hoc members may be appointed by the RIO to ensure the membership of the RIIP has the proper expertise during the misconduct proceedings. These individuals will become ad hoc voting members of the CRI if an investigation results from the inquiry for the duration of the case in question. RIIP members shall be carefully selected in order to minimize either the substance or the appearance of personal or professional conflicts of interest. No member of the RIIP will be assigned to an allegation involving his or her own department.

E. Charge to the RIIP and First Meeting

The RIO will prepare a charge for the RIIP that:

- sets forth the time for completion of the inquiry
- describes the allegations and any related issues identified during the allegation assessment
states that the purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the evidence, which may include the testimony of the respondent, complainant and key witnesses, to determine whether an investigation is warranted, not to determine whether research or academic misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible.

states that an investigation is warranted if the RIIP determines: (1) there is a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research or academic misconduct and, if relevant, is within the jurisdictional criteria of 42 CFR § 93.102(b); and, (2) the allegation may have substance, based on the RIIP's review during the inquiry.

informs the RIIP that they are responsible for preparing or directing the preparation of a written report of the inquiry that meets the requirements of this policy and 42 CFR § 93.309(a), if applicable.

At the RIIP's first meeting for an inquiry, the RIO will review the charge; discuss the allegations, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry; assist the RIIP with organizing plans for the inquiry; and answer any questions raised by the RIIP.

F. Inquiry Process

The RIIP may interview the complainant, the respondent, and key witnesses as well as examine relevant research records and materials. The RIIP will evaluate the evidence, including any testimony obtained during the inquiry. The scope of the inquiry is not required to and does not normally include deciding whether misconduct definitely occurred, determining definitely who committed the misconduct or conducting exhaustive interviews and analyses. However, if a legally sufficient admission of research or academic misconduct is made by the respondent, misconduct may be determined at the inquiry stage if all relevant issues are resolved. In that case, if applicable, SIUE shall promptly consult with ORI or relevant agency to determine the next steps that should be taken.

G. Time for Completion

The inquiry, including preparation of the final inquiry report and the decision of the DO on whether an investigation is warranted, must be completed within 60 calendar days of initiation of the inquiry, unless the RIO determines that circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. If the RIO approves an extension, the inquiry record must include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period. The respondent will be notified in writing of the extension.

VI. The Inquiry Report

A. Elements of the Inquiry Report

A written inquiry report shall be prepared by the RIIP that includes the following information:

1. the name and position of the respondent
2. a description of the allegations of research or academic misconduct
3. all funding support, including, for example, grant numbers, grant applications, contracts and publications listing funding support, if applicable
4. the names and titles of the RIIP members and ad hoc members who conducted the inquiry
5. a summary of the inquiry process
6. a list of the research records reviewed and summaries of any interviews conducted
7. the basis for recommending or not recommending that the allegations warrant an investigation
8. any recommendations for other actions to be taken if the RIIP does not recommend investigation
9. any comments on the draft report by the respondent.

SIUE legal counsel should review the report for legal sufficiency. Modifications should be made as appropriate in consultation with the RIO and the RIIP.

B. Notification to the Respondent and Opportunity to Comment

The RIO shall notify the respondent whether the inquiry found an investigation to be warranted, include a copy of the
d the inquiry report for comment, include a copy of or refer to 42 CFR Part 93, if applicable, and SIUE's policies and procedures on research or academic misconduct. The respondent shall be allowed 5 business days from receipt of the draft report to provide the RIO with their comments on the report. The RIO may notify the complainant whether the inquiry found an investigation to be warranted.

Any comments that are submitted by the respondent will be attached as an appendix to the final inquiry report. Based on the comments, the RIIP may revise the draft report as appropriate and prepare it in final form.

B. Institutional Decision and Notification

1. Decision by Designated Official
   The RIO will transmit the final inquiry report and any comments to the DO. The DO will, after consulting with the RIO and/or the RIIP members, decide whether an investigation is warranted based on the criteria in this policy and 42 CFR § 93.307(d). Any finding that an investigation is warranted must be made in writing by the DO.

2. Notification to ORI or Sponsor, if Relevant
   For allegations that fall within the statute of limitations of 42 CFR § 93.105 for misconduct under 42 CFR § 93.307, within 30 calendar days of the DO's decision that an investigation is warranted, the RIO will provide ORI with the DO's written decision and a copy of the inquiry report. The RIO will also notify those SIUE officials who need to know of the DO's decision. The RIO must provide the following information to ORI upon request: (1) SIUE policies and procedures under which the inquiry was conducted; (2) the research records and evidence reviewed, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, and copies of all relevant documents; and (3) the changes to be considered in the investigation. If applicable, the sponsor or other relevant agency will be notified per their requirements.

3. Documentation of Decision Not to Investigate
   If the DO decides that an investigation is not warranted, the RIO shall secure and maintain for 5 years after the termination of the inquiry sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment by ORI or other agency of the reasons why an investigation was not conducted. These documents must be provided to ORI, other authorized HHS personnel, or another applicable agency upon request.

VII. Conducting the Investigation

A. Initiation and Purpose
   The investigation must begin within 30 calendar days after the determination by the DO that an investigation is warranted. The purpose of the investigation is to develop a factual record by exploring the allegations in detail and examining the evidence in depth, leading to recommended findings on whether research or academic misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent. The investigation will also determine whether there are additional instances of possible research or academic misconduct that would justify broadening the scope beyond the initial allegations. This is particularly important where the alleged research or academic misconduct involves clinical trials or potential harm to human subjects or the general public or if it affects research that forms the basis for public policy, clinical practice, or public health practice. For research misconduct, 42 CFR § 93.313 requires that the findings of the investigation must be set forth in an investigation report.

B. Notifying ORI or Other Agency and Respondent: Sequestration of Research Records
For cases of research misconduct, on or before the date on which the investigation begins, the RIO must: (1) in cases of funded research notify the ORI Director or relevant agency of the decision to begin the investigation and provide a copy of the inquiry report, and (2) notify the respondent in writing of the allegations to be investigated. The RIO must also give the respondent written notice of any new allegations of research or academic misconduct within a reasonable amount of time of deciding to pursue allegations not addressed during the inquiry or in the initial notice of the investigation.

The RIO will, prior to notifying respondent of the allegations, take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of and sequester in a secure manner all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research or academic misconduct proceeding that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry. The need for additional sequestration of records for the investigation may occur for any number of reasons, including SIUE's decision to investigate additional allegations not considered during the inquiry stage or the identification of records during the inquiry process that had not been previously secured. The procedures to be followed for sequestration during the investigation are the same procedures that apply during the inquiry.

C. Change to the Committee and the First Meeting

1. Change to the Committee on Research Integrity
   The RIO will define the subject matter of the investigation in a written charge to the CRI that:

   - describes the allegations and related issues identified during the inquiry
   - identifies the respondent
   - informs the committee that it must conduct the investigation as prescribed in this policy
   - defines research or academic misconduct
   - informs the committee that it must evaluate the evidence and testimony to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, research or academic misconduct occurred and, if so, the type and extent of it and who was responsible
   - informs the committee that in order to determine that the respondent committed research or academic misconduct it must find that a preponderance of the evidence establishes that: (1) research or academic misconduct, as defined in this policy, occurred (respondent has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence any affirmative defenses raised, including honest error or a difference of opinion); (2) the research or academic misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant academic community; and (3) the respondent committed the research or academic misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly
   - informs the committee that it must prepare or direct the preparation of a written investigation report that meets the requirements of this policy or 42 CFR § 93.313 if applicable.

2. First Meeting
   The RIO will convene the first meeting of the CRI to review the change, the inquiry report, and the prescribed procedures and standards for the conduct of the investigation, including the necessity for confidentiality and for developing a specific investigation plan. The CRI will be provided with a copy of this policy and procedures and 42 CFR Part 93, if applicable. The RIO will be present or available throughout the investigation to advise the committee as needed.

D. Investigation Process

The CRI and the RIO must:

- use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of each allegation
- take reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practical
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- interview each respondent, complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent, and record and transcribe each interview, provide the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction, and include the recording or transcript in the record of the investigation
- pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of any additional instances of possible research or academic misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.

E. Time for Completion

The investigation is to be completed within 120 calendar days of beginning it, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report to ORI or other agency, if applicable. However, if the ROIC determines that the investigation will not be completed within this 120-day period, they will submit in the case of research misconduct to ORI or other agency, if applicable, a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay. For academic misconduct, the ROIC will request an extension from the DO. The ROIC will ensure that periodic progress reports are filed with ORI or other agency, if applicable, if the request for an extension is granted and the filing of such reports is required.

VIII. The Investigation Report

A. Elements of the Investigation Report

The CRI is responsible for preparing a written draft report of the investigation that:

- describes the nature of the allegation of research or academic misconduct, including identification of the respondent
- describes and documents, if relevant, the funded support, including, for example, the numbers of any grants that are involved, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing research support
- describes the specific allegations of research or academic misconduct considered in the investigation
- includes SIUE policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, unless those policies and procedures were provided previously
- identifies and summarizes the research records and evidence reviewed and identifies any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed
- includes a statement of findings for each allegation of research or academic misconduct identified during the investigation. Each statement of findings must: (1) identify the type of research or academic misconduct (e.g., was misconduct fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism) and whether it was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly, (2) summarize the facts and the analysis that support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent, including any effort by respondent to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she did not engage in research or academic misconduct because of honest error or a difference of opinion; (3) identify the specific funded support; (4) identify whether any publications need correction or retraction; (5) identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and (6) list any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending with external entities.

B. Comments on the Draft Report and Access to Evidence
1. **Respondent**
   The RIO must give the respondent a copy of the draft investigation report for comment and, concurrently, a copy of or supervised access to the evidence on which the report is based. The respondent will be allowed 30 days from the date of receipt of the draft report to submit comments to the RIO. The respondent's comments will be included and considered in the final report.

2. **Confidentiality**
   In distributing the draft report, or portions thereof, to the respondent, the RIO will inform the recipient of the confidentiality under which the draft report is made available and may establish reasonable conditions to ensure such confidentiality. For example, the RIO may require that the recipient sign a confidentiality agreement.

C. **Decision by Deciding Official**
   The RIO will assist the CRI in finalizing the draft investigation report, including ensuring that the respondent's comments are included and considered, and transmit the final investigation report to the DO. The DO will determine: (1) whether SIUE accepts the investigation report, its findings, including the recommended institutional actions; or (2) whether to return the report to the CRI with a request for further fact-finding or analysis. If the DO determines that the appropriate institutional actions in response to the accepted findings of research or academic misconduct should vary from the findings of the CRI, the DO will, as part of their written determination, explain in detail the basis for rendering a decision different from the findings of the CRI. For cases involving employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement, the employee may request a disciplinary hearing pursuant to the terms of the collective bargaining agreement prior to the implementation of any disciplinary action.

   When a final decision on the case has been reached, the RIO will normally notify both the respondent and the complainant in writing. After informing ORI or other agency, if applicable, the DO will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case. The RIO is responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements of funding or sponsoring agencies.

D. **Appeals**
   The DO's decision is final. There is no option to appeal through this policy, although appeal options may exist through discipline processes in collective bargaining agreements.

E. **Notice to ORI or Other Agency of SIUE Findings and Actions**
   If applicable, unless an extension has been granted, the RIO must, within the 120-day period for completing the investigation, submit the following to ORI or other agency: (1) a copy of the final investigation report with all attachments; (2) a statement of whether SIUE accepts the findings of the investigation; (3) a statement of whether SIUE found misconduct and, if so, who committed the misconduct; and (4) a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the respondent.

F. **Maintaining Records for Review by ORI or Other Agency**
   For research misconduct governed by 42 CFR Part 93, the RIO must maintain and provide to ORI or other agency upon request “records of research misconduct proceedings” as that term is defined by 42 CFR § 93.317. Unless custody has been transferred to HHS or ORI or another agency has advised in writing that the records no longer need to be retained, records of research misconduct proceedings must be maintained in a secure manner for 7 years after completion of the proceeding or the completion of any PHS or other agency proceeding involving the research misconduct allegation. The RIO is also responsible for providing any information, documentation, research records,
IX. Completion of Cases; Reporting Premature Closures to ORI

Generally, all inquiries and investigations will be carried through to completion and all significant issues will be pursued diligently. The RIO must notify ORI or other agency, if applicable, in advance if there are plans to close a case at the inquiry or investigation stage on the basis that respondent has admitted guilt, a settlement with the respondent has been reached, or for any other reason, except: (1) closing of a case at the inquiry stage on the basis that an investigation is not warranted or (2) a finding of no misconduct at the investigation stage, which must be reported to ORI or other agency, as prescribed in this policy and 42 CFR § 93.315. For employees represented by a collective bargaining agreement, notification pursuant to this section shall take place only after the conclusion of appropriate discipline processes.

X. Institutional Administrative Actions

If the DO determines that research or academic misconduct is substantiated by the findings, he or she will decide on the appropriate actions to be taken, after consultation with the RIO. The administrative actions may include but are not limited to:

- withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the project in which research or academic misconduct was found
- removal of the responsible person from the particular project, letter of reprimand, special monitoring of future work, probation, suspension, salary reduction, or initiation of steps leading to possible rank reduction or termination of employment
- restitution of funds to the grantor agency as appropriate
- other action, including disciplinary measures up to and including termination, appropriate to the research or academic misconduct.

XI. Other Considerations

A. Termination or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation

The termination of the respondent's SIUE employment, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible research or academic misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate the misconduct proceeding or otherwise limit any of SIUE's responsibilities under 42 CFR Part 93, when applicable.

If the respondent, without admitting to misconduct, elects to resign his or her position after SIUE receives an allegation of research or academic misconduct, the assessment of the allegation will proceed, as well as the inquiry and investigation, as appropriate based on the outcome of the preceding steps. If the respondent refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the RIO and any inquiry or investigation committee will use their best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in the report the respondent's failure to cooperate and its effect on the evidence.

B. Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation
Following a final finding of no research or academic misconduct, including ORI concurrence where required by 42 CFR Part 93, if applicable, the RIO shall, at the request of the respondent and as appropriate, undertake reasonable and practical efforts to restore the respondent’s reputation. Depending on the particular circumstances and the views of the respondent, the RIO should consider notifying those individuals aware of or involved in the investigation of the final outcome, publicizing the final outcome in any forum in which the allegation of research or academic misconduct was previously publicized, and expunging all reference to the research or academic misconduct allegation from the respondent’s personnel file. Any institutional actions to restore the respondent’s reputation should first be approved by the DO.

C. Protection
During the research or academic misconduct proceeding and upon its completion, regardless of whether SIUE, ORI, or other agency, if applicable, determines that research or academic misconduct occurred, the RIO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to counter potential or actual retaliation against, any complainant who made allegations of research or academic misconduct in good faith and of any witnesses and committee members who cooperate in good faith with the research or academic misconduct proceeding.

D. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith
If relevant, the DO will determine whether the complainant’s allegations of research or academic misconduct were made in good faith or whether a witness or committee member acted in good faith. If the DO determines that there was an absence of good faith they will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against the person who failed to act in good faith.
Conflicts of Interest and Commitment - IQ9

The teaching, research, and service mission of SIUE must be conducted in an objective manner, free from undue influence arising from private or other special interests. The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for recognizing, disclosing, and managing conflicts of interest and commitment.

The University and its employees often benefit from the employees’ participation in both public and private outside activities. Employees must ensure that their outside obligations, financial interests, and activities do not conflict or interfere with their commitments to the integrity of the project, the sponsor, the University, and the public interest. This obligation pertains to both full-time and part-time employees.

This policy sets forth procedures and guidelines that are to be followed in avoiding actual or potential conflicts of interest and commitments. This policy applies to all sponsored projects, employment outside SIUE, and volunteer activities. Certain provisions apply only to employees receiving funding from the Public Health Service (PHS) and other entities requiring financial conflicts of interest disclosure. Additional guidance is provided on the Human Resources website.

I. General Principles
   A. Employees must arrange their professional obligations and financial interests so as not to impede or conflict with their duties and responsibilities to the University.
   B. Unless otherwise exempted by making university policies, employees must notify the University of potential conflicts of interest, including potential financial conflicts of interest, and conflicts of commitment by submitting the appropriate form or using the appropriate online portal.
   C. Employees must disclose potential financial conflicts of interest that could affect the design, conduct, or reporting of sponsored projects from entities that require disclosure of potential and actual financial conflicts of interest. The University will endeavor to keep disclosed financial information confidential.
   D. Employees may not maintain unacceptable conflicts of interests or commitment.
   E. No person employed by the University may have an interest or commitment incompatible with the University. An interest incompatible with the University includes but is not limited to any commitment between an employee and a domestic entity.
      1. that may restrict or impede the employee’s ability to perform his/her activities at the University; or
      2. that results in the transfer or compensation of making or potential university rights in intellectual property; or
      3. that utilizes university assets without prior written approval of the University.
   F. Charges of violations of this policy shall be carefully examined. Charges shall be processed through the normal complaint channels. Disciplinary sanctions may range from reprimands to dismissal, pursuant to University policies and any applicable bargaining agreements.

II. Conflicts of Interest
   A. A conflict of interest encompasses any situation in which an employee of the University is in a position to use his or her influence or authority within the University to advance his or her own personal or financial interests or the personal or financial interests of his or her immediate family or an associated entity.
   B. An “associated entity” of any employee means any trust, organization or enterprise other than the University over which the employee, alone or together with his or her immediate family, exercises a controlling interest.
C. "Business" means any corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, firm, franchise, association, organization, holding company, joint stock company, franchise, business or real estate trust, or any other legal entity organized for profit or charitable purposes.

D. "Executive position" refers to any position which includes responsibilities for a material segment of the operation or management of a business, including serving on its Board of Directors.

E. The "family" of an employee includes his or her spouse, civil union or domestic partner, and other persons who are related to the employee biologically or by law.

F. Unacceptable conflicts of interest include but are not limited to:
   1. directing to outside entities grant/contract support the University might otherwise expect;
   2. using University and other public resources, including assigned time and facilities, for private gain without proper compensation to or consent from the University;
   3. engaging in the dissemination of research information or creative activities;
   4. using a position of influence or authority to involve other employees or students of the University in non-university activities without the consent and supervision of the University;
   5. using privileged information acquired in connection with the employer's activities for personal gain or unauthorized use;
   6. negotiating or influencing the negotiation of gifts and contracts with organizations with which the employee has consulting or other significant relationships;
   7. accepting gratuities or special favors from private organizations with which the University does or may conduct business;
   8. retaining patients or special favors to employees of an organization under circumstances which might reasonably be interpreted as an attempt to influence the recipient in the conduct of their duties.

III. Conflicts of Commitment
   
   A. A "conflict of commitment" encompasses any situation in which outside activities undertaken by the individual are sufficiently demanding of the individual's time and attention as to interfere or appear to interfere with his or her obligations to the University. A conflict of commitment may also arise if the individual is concurrently conducting activities sponsored by a federal, state, or local public agency or a private corporation.

   B. Conflicts of commitment may arise between the individual and the University as a result of non-competing agreements, grants and contracts with outside agencies, and individual or family involvement in private financial interests or commercial enterprises.

   C. Under Illinois law and University Policy (Policy on Outside Employment for Faculty, Personnel Section M900, II.11.), all full-time faculty of the University are required to obtain the prior written approval of the Chancellor of the University or the Chancellor's designee before undertaking, contracting for, or accepting anything of value in return for project or consulting services from any external person or organization. Further, the law requires prospective reporting, through the filing of an annual statement by the employees, indicating the amount of actual time spent on such outside research or consulting services.

   D. There are two principles that broadly govern conflict of commitment:
      1. As an employee of the University, the individual's commitment and obligation to the University must have priority over the commitments to outside interests.
2. University resources may not be used either for personal gain, private gain, or in support of outside agencies, without proper approval of the University. Unacceptable conflicts of commitment include but are not limited to the following:

3. Commitment of Time: Ordinarily, University employers are given the opportunity to pursue outside interests that are consistent with the mission of the University. However, if the time commitment to these activities becomes excessive, the educational mission of the University will suffer.

4. Commitment of Resources: Individuals who are engaged in non-university activities may not use university resources without prior approval of the University. Such resources include the use of university facilities (such as labs, classrooms, and office space) and university assets (such as instrumentation, software, and computing). Facilities and other assets may be used in outside activities with the University’s prior permission if the external or private entity agrees to provide suitable compensation to the University.

5. Commitment of Other Individuals: In general, individuals may not involve students in outside activities unless it can be demonstrated that participation in these activities affords a substantial educational benefit for the student. Cases involving use of students must be carefully monitored by the academic unit and not by the individual.

6. Intellectual Property: If a university employee may sell or transfer rights to patents, licenses, or copyrights of scholarly works owned by the University to any external agency, patents or other proprietary rights must be shared by the University in accordance with arrangements set forth contractually and pursuant to the University’s Intellectual Property Policy.

7. Use of the University’s Name: The individual shall not use the University’s name without prior University approval.

E. Conflicts of commitment may also arise if the employee is simultaneously engaged in publicly and privately sponsored activities. In this case, it is the responsibility of the University to assure that public funds designated for the activity are not channeled to private individuals or organizations and that results from publicly financed activities are appropriately disseminated. Examples of these types of conflict may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Unnecessary delaying or withholding from publication results of publicly supported activities while making the results available exclusively to a private organization
2. Using public funds to conduct activities for private individuals or organizations
3. Refusing a sponsored project to serve the research or other needs of a private organization without disclosure to the University and to the sponsoring agency
4. Purchasing major equipment, instruments, materials, or other items for the University from a family member or a private organization in which the investigator serves without the disclosure of such interest
5. Consulting or holding grants or contracts with two or more entities without informing the other parties of conflict of commitments
6. Transmission of Government-sponsored work products, results, materials, software, data, or information that are not made generally available to a private individual or organization for personal gain. (This requirement would not necessarily preclude appropriate licensing arrangements for investment or commercialization.)
consulting on the basis of government-sponsored research results where there is significant additional work by the employee independent of the government-sponsored research.

7. Using for personal gain or other unauthorized use of confidential information acquired in connection with the employee's government-sponsored activities (the term "confidential information" includes but is not limited to medical, personal, and security records of individuals, anticipated material requirements or future actions, possible new sites for government operations, and knowledge of forthcoming programs or of selection of contractors or subcontractors in advance of official announcements).

8. Negotiating or influencing the negotiation of contracts relating to the employee's sponsored project between the University and private organizations with which the employee has consulting or other significant relationship.

9. Accepting guarantees or special favors from private organizations with which the University does or may conduct business in connection with a sponsored project and extension of guarantees or special favors to employees of the sponsor under circumstances which might reasonably be interpreted as an attempt to influence the recipients in the conduct of their duties.

IV. Distribution of Effort

A. The way in which an employee divides his effort among the various job functions and responsibilities does not raise ethical questions unless the sponsor supporting a project is misled in its understanding of the amount of intellectual effort an employee is actually devoting to the research in question. A system of part-time accounting is incompatible with the inherent character of the work of a faculty member because the various functions performed are closely integrated and do not conform to any meaningful division of a standard work week. On the other hand, if the project agreement contemplated that an employee will devote a certain fraction of effort to the sponsored project or the employee agrees to assume responsibility in relation to such project a demonstrable relationship between the included effort and responsibility and the actual extent of involvement is to be expected.

V. Consulting for government agencies or their contractors

A. When an employee engaged in a government-sponsored project also serves as a consultant to a federal agency, his or her conduct is subject to the provisions of the Conflict of Interest Act (5 U.S.C. 203-209 as amended) and all other provisions governing special government employees. (See, for example, the United States Office of Contracting Ethics.) When an employee consults for one or more government contractors or prospective contractors in the same technical field as his or her research project, care must be taken to avoid giving advice that may be of questionable objectivity because of its possible bearing on the employee's other interests. In undertaking and performing consulting services, the employee must make full disclosure of such interests to the University and to the contractor in such as they may appear to relate to the work at the University or for the contractor. Conflict of interest problems could arise, for example, in the participation of an employee of the University in an evaluation for the government agency or its contractors of some technical aspects of the work of another organization with which the employee has a consulting or employment relationship or a significant financial interest or in an evaluation of a competitor to such other organization.

VI. Sponsorship-Related Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure (PCOD)

A. Certain sponsors, including the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS), which covers agencies such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH), require the University and
B. Definitions

1. **Conflict of Interest** means a state of affairs in which an investigator or his or her immediate family has significant financial interests that could reasonably be expected to influence the design, conduct, or reporting of the funded project. This may include perceived, potential, or actual conflicts of interest in research by establishing standards that provide a reasonable expectation that the design, conduct, and reporting of projects will be free from bias resulting from financial conflicts of interest.

2. **Immediate family** means the investigator’s spouse, child under age 18, and any person who resides with the investigator or with whom the investigator shares support.

3. **Investigator** means the project director or any other person regardless of title who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of a project funded by the sponsor, which may include collaborators, subcontractors, and consultants.

4. **Institutional Responsibilities** means the investigator’s professional responsibilities on behalf of SUSE, including scholarship, consultation, teaching, professional practice, and university committee membership.

5. **Significant Financial Interest (SFI)** means one or more of the following interests of the investigator and his or her immediate family that reasonably appear to be related to the investigator’s institutional responsibilities. Remuneration includes salary and any payment for services not otherwise identified as salary as well as equity interest including stock, stock options, and ownership interest.

   a. A SFI exists in relation to a publicly traded entity if the value of any remuneration received in the last 12 months preceding the disclosure is equal to or exceeds $5,000.

   b. A SFI exists in relation to non-publicly traded entities when the value of remuneration received is $5,000 or when the investigator and his/her family hold any equity interest or any intellectual property rights in any intellectual property rights and interests. Note that there is no minimum value for equity interest in non-publicly traded entities.

   c. A SFI includes any reimbursed or sponsored travel related to his or her institutional responsibilities. Reimbursed or sponsored travel includes travel that is paid on behalf of the investigator but not reimbursed directly to the investigator.

The following are excluded from the definition of significant financial interest:

   d. Salary, royalties, or other remuneration paid to the investigator for appropriate grant and contract activity.

   e. Intellectual property rights assigned to SUSE and agreements to share royalties related to those rights.

   f. Income from investment vehicles such as mutual funds and retirement accounts as long as the investigator does not
C. Financial Disclosures

The University must report promptly to the sponsor any conflicts of interest the University has identified, including those of its subrecipients and subcontracts, and provide assurance that the interests have been managed prior to expending any funds under an award. If:

1. the award is found to be related to the design, conduct or reporting of the project or
2. an investigator fails to comply with the University’s FCOI policy or a
   FCOI management plan;
3. a FCOI management plan appears to have failed the design, conduct, or
   reporting of the funded project;

Any conflicts of interest identified in the disclosure process must be resolved before the University can approve the individual’s activity on the project. The University must complete and document retrospective reviews within 120 days of the University’s determination of noncompliance for SPPIs not disclosed in a timely manner or previously reviewed or whenever an FCOI is not identified or managed in a timely manner.

The University will comply with the sponsor’s public disclosure requirements.

NHPP’s online guidance regarding public accessibility will be followed.

D. Procedures

Procedures for this Policy will be managed by the Graduate School in compliance with all state and federal rules and regulations. These procedures may be revised by the Graduate School as necessary. Additional guidance is provided on the Human

E. Training

Each investigator must complete FCOI training prior to engaging in a project requiring FCOI disclosure. Investigators must complete training every 4 years and immediately when any of the following occur:

1. the University finds the investigator noncompliant with its policy or a
   management plan;
2. the investigator is new to the University;
3. the University policy changes in a manner that significantly affects
   requirements.

F. Record Keeping

The University must maintain FCOI-related records for at least 3 years after the termination of the activity (date of the final financial report and progress report to the funding agency). Before destroying or disposing of any University records,
consult with the University's Office of Records Management for any additional State records retention requirements.

C. Sanctions

Changes of violations of this policy shall be carefully examined. Changes shall be processed in the normal reporting channels. Disciplinary sanctions may range from reprimands to dismissal, pursuant to University policies and any applicable collective bargaining agreements.

When the Department of Health and Human Services determines that a PHS/NIH-funded research project of clinical research whose purpose is to evaluate the safety of effectiveness of a drug, medical device, or treatment has been designed, conducted, or reported by an investigator with a POGU that was not managed or reported by the University as required by regulation, the investigator shall:

1. disclose the POGU in each public presentation of the results of the research;
2. request an addendum to previously published presentations.

VII. Permissible Activities (providing appropriate approval)

A. Employees may accept royalties for published works and patents and honoraria for papers and lectures pursuant to University policy. For Faculty, each acceptance shall be subject to the "Policy on Use of Material from Which Instructional Materials," (SUE, Faculty Handbook, https://www.siu.edu/provost/fhs/7-17.shtml).

B. Employees may accept payments as a consultant to an outside entity provided that the time commitment does not exceed unit and university policy and that the arrangement does not alter the employee's commitment to the University. For Faculty, each acceptance shall be subject to the "Policy on Outside Employment for Faculty" (SUE, Faculty Handbook, http://www.siu.edu/provost/fhs/7-17.shtml).

C. Employees may serve on boards and committees of outside entities that does not conflict from the faculty members' obligations to the University.

VIII. University Responsibility

A. The University shall make known to the sponsor:
1. the steps it is taking to assure an understanding of the past the University administrative and employees of the possible conflicts of interest or other problems that may develop in the foregoing types of situations
2. the organizational and administrative actions it has taken or is taking to avoid such problems, including:
   a. accounting procedures to be used to assure that sponsor funds are expended for the purposes for which they have been provided and that all services which are required in return for these funds are supplied
   b. procedures that enable it to be aware of the outside professional work of staff members participating in sponsored projects if such outside work relates in any way to the sponsored project
   c. the formulation of standards to guide the individual University employees in governing their conduct in relation to outside interests that might raise questions on conflicts of interest
   d. the provision within the University of an informed source of advice and guidance to its employees for advance consultation on questions they wish to raise concerning the problems that may or do develop as a result of their outside
Regular review of policy. Input received from Legal Counsel and the Office of Technology Transfer. Additional input received from HR and Legal Counsel regarding “Domestic partner” terminology.

Financial or consulting interests as they relate to their participation in sponsored projects.

Approved by Chancellor effective 9/9/15.

This policy was issued on September 18, 2015, replacing the September 17, 2014 version.

Document Reference: LCF

Origin: GC/R/12/04; GB, 11/14/15; GC 9/9/15
HONORS PROGRAM
UPDATE: SPRING 2019

Opportunities and Challenges

GROWING SCALE

- 550 Honors students on campus (~4.8% of undergraduate population)
- 434 in the new program
- Major Distribution of the 434 (see handout)
DISTRIBUTION BY UNIT

- CAS: 171 (39%)
- SOE: 86 (20%)
- SOP: 71 (16%)
- SEHHB: 42 (10%)
- SON: 37 (9%)
- SOB: 27 (6%)

- Total: 434 (100%)

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Honors Program</th>
<th>SIUE Undergraduate Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Alaska Nat</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>28 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>24 (5.5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>325 (74%)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22 (5%)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>30 (7%)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$150K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$156K</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$200K</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$260K</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$298K (+$57K (CIG)=$343K)</td>
<td>10% (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20 (projected)</td>
<td>$350K-$375K</td>
<td>4-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEVELOPING CURRICULUM

- Number of courses
  - AY13/14: 6
  - AY15/16: 13
  - AY16/17: 27 (the first year of implementation of the new curriculum)
  - AY18/19: 51
- Range of Departmental Involvement
  - AY13/14: History, Nursing, Philosophy
  - AY18/19: ACS, Biology, Computer Science, Criminal Justice, Educational Leadership, English, Foreign Language, Geography, History, Library Science (LIS), Music, Nursing, Pharmacy, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, Social Work
INCREASING CENTRALIZATION TO SUPPORT THE CURRICULUM

- We began last fall (F18) to do all book ordering/textbook rental through the honors office (for this term, S19); will continue.

- We handle all student evaluations for honors seminars (we can build them to reflect any department's particular additional needs/requirements).

- The UHAC began in F18 voluntary peer-to-peer teaching observation visits. We will continue to encourage and expand.

---

ONE MEASURE OF VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Term</th>
<th>Honors Count</th>
<th>Retained Count</th>
<th>Surv of % Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: 704 742 55.1%

One-year retention data for newly enrolled honors students at end of each Fall term
ANOTHER MEASURE OF VALUE: GRADUATION RATES (COMPARATIVE)

- Honors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted Term</th>
<th>Within 4 Years</th>
<th>Within 5 Years</th>
<th>Within 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Non-honors (but eligible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted Term</th>
<th>Within 4 Years</th>
<th>Within 5 Years</th>
<th>Within 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CURRENT INITIATIVES

- Honors Assistant Director Search; will in place by 1 July 2019

- Guaranteed Admissions Track to SIU Law for SIUE Honors students (expect to begin: Fall 2019)

- Working on an accelerated STEM/MBA option for Honors students
FUTURE INITIATIVES


- In preliminary negotiations with LCCC Honors College to develop an articulation agreement between the two programs for seamless transfer of their honors students into SIUE’s Honors Program.

- Integrate the UHAC (University Honors Advisory Council) into the Faculty Senate.

- Develop criteria and procedures for affiliating faculty with the Honors Program.

THE LONG GAME

- If successful with these future initiatives, and depending on the outcome of the internal and external reviews, we should be positioned to begin a serious conversation about the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a full-fledged Honors College in AY 2023-2024.
OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Opportunities
- For faculty: opportunities to experiment pedagogically and to work in an interdisciplinary fashion
- For your students: to be exposed to a wide range of ideas and to sharpen their skills

Challenges
- Staffing (in particular, coming up, the last phase of the curricular build-out, HONS 499)
Faculty Senate

Curriculum Council Operating Papers

I. Membership

The membership of the Curriculum Council will be determined in accord with the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (Bylaws VI, Section C.).

A. The Curriculum Council shall have representation distributed as follows:

1. Faculty Representation: The Executive Committee shall appoint to the Council a minimum of nine to twelve faculty (as defined by the Faculty Senate) representatives from among those elected by academic units. Terms of office shall be for one year, with annual reappointment by the Executive Committee.

2. Student Representation: Two students shall be appointed to the Council by the Student Senate for annual terms. Students must qualify for membership in the Student Senate. These representatives shall be voting members of the Council.

3. The following shall be ex-officio, voting members of the Council: the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, the University Registrar, the Director of Educational Outreach, the Director of Academic Advising, the Director of Learning Support Services, the Director of Assessment, the Director of General Education or their designated representatives, and the Chair of the General Education Committee. The following shall be ex-officio, non-voting member of the Council: Director of the Honors Program.

II. Officers

A. The Chairperson of the Curriculum Council for the coming year shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate Past-President, President, and President-Elect in accord with Faculty Senate Bylaws V, Section B. This appointment shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval at the May meeting.

B. The Chairperson of the Curriculum Council shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Convene and facilitate regular meetings of the Council

2. Appoint Chairs of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee; Undergraduate Courses Committee; Undergraduate Programs Committee; and ad hoc Committees with Council approval, appoint a Secretary of the Council and other officers, with approval of the Council.

3. With the Chair of the General Education Committee, identify and present to the Curriculum Council membership recommendations for this Committee.

4. Serve as member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
5. Serve as liaison for the Council to the University Governance Office, for purposes of: monitoring the progress of course/program change requests through the review and approval process; maintaining up to date Curriculum Council minutes and other documents on-line.

6. Attend and report regularly to the Faculty Senate on the work of the Council, including any items needing Senate review and/or action.

7. Maintain Curriculum Council records of course/program approval actions; amendments to Operating Papers; and other actions of Curriculum Council Committees.

8. Provide leadership to the Council in matters relevant to the Council's charge, consistent with the Council's powers and functions, described in Section III of the Curriculum Council Operating Papers.

C. The Secretary of the Council shall take minutes at all meetings of the Council and submit these minutes to the Chairperson for review.

III. Powers and Functions

A. The powers and functions of the Curriculum Council are those established by the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (Bylaws V, Section G). The Curriculum Council is responsible to the Faculty Senate for formulating and recommending policy on undergraduate curriculum (instructional programs, courses of study, definitions of certificates, diplomas, degrees, student entrance, retention and exit), for formulating and reviewing undergraduate curricular policy proposals, for reviewing the administration of all undergraduate curricular matters, and for conducting undergraduate program reviews. "Undergraduate" shall be defined as including both dental and continuing education students.

B. Illustrative of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Curriculum Council are the following:

1. Recommending policy on requirements for entrance, retention, and graduation for undergraduates.

2. Recommending policy on requirements for undergraduate majors and minors.

3. Recommending policy on adopting new programs or eliminating existing programs.

4. Recommending policy on grading students.

5. Recommending policy on accepting credit from other institutions or testing programs.

6. Recommending policy on advising undergraduates.

7. Recommending policy concerning the special problems that may arise with regard to teaching undergraduates at centers other than the main campus.
8. Maintaining a continuing review and evaluation of Continuing Education programs.

9. Maintaining a continuing review and evaluation of undergraduate programs and courses. The Curriculum Council shall review each program review committee's report. Once a committee report has been approved, the Council shall evaluate whether the program is in good standing, is flagged for priority review, or should have its enrollment suspended. A program is flagged for priority review when it has substantial areas of concern. The priority review will occur in a time and manner as determined by Illinois Board of Higher Education regulations. If the priority review does not show substantial improvement in the program, the Curriculum Council, in consultation with the Provost, can suspend enrollment.

10. Recommending policy regarding the University's Assessment Plan.

11. Participating in the selection of the Director of Assessment when a vacancy occurs and when the term of office of the incumbent Director is expiring.

12. Participating in the selection of the Director of General Education when a vacancy occurs and when the term of office of the incumbent Director is expiring.

IV. Meetings

A. The Curriculum Council shall normally meet the third Thursday of each month at 2:30 p.m. Special meetings will be called by the chairperson when deemed necessary.

B. A quorum shall consist of the physical presence of at least half of the total number of voting members of Curriculum Council. Members of the Curriculum Council who wish to remotely attend Council meetings (e.g., by telephone or electronically) can only do so in a manner consistent with the Illinois Open Meetings Act, and with consent of the Chairperson.

C. Agenda of Meetings

1. The chairperson shall prepare the agenda of meetings.

2. Council members may place items on the agenda by request to the chairperson.

3. Notice of the time, place and agenda of all meetings of the Council shall be delivered to all members of the Council, and in compliance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act, made available to the public at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

4. A maximum of 15 minutes shall be allotted at the end of the meeting for public comment. No individual speaker shall be allowed to speak for more than 5 minutes.

V. Standing Committees and Operations

A. Undergraduate Programs Committee (UPC)
1. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall be appointed from among the members of the Council by the Council Chairperson with the approval of a majority of the Council. The term of office shall be one year; the same chairperson may not serve more than three successive terms.

2. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall appoint at least five additional members to the Committee, ensuring a simple majority of faculty is always present. These appointments shall be approved by a majority of the Council. The term of Committee members shall be one year; they may succeed themselves, but cannot hold more than three consecutive terms. However, a representative of the Registrar’s Office shall serve as an ex officio member.

3. The Undergraduate Programs Committee has the responsibility to review proposals for modifications, additions or terminations of programs. The Committee shall forward such proposals to the Council, recommending either approval or disapproval. All proposals for changes in programs approved by the Council shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final action.

4. The Undergraduate Programs Committee shall meet at the call of the Committee Chairperson.

5. Procedure of the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall be as follows:

   a. University proposals related to curriculum changes that come to the Undergraduate Programs Committee shall be divided by the Chairperson into the following three classes:

      (1) Class 1 - proposals for program modification that involve only minor changes such as wording of program titles or program description.

      (2) Class 2 - proposals that request substantive changes in programs already in existence. Substantive changes include changes in credit hours, program content, and program requirements.

      (3) Class 3 - proposals that request new programs, propose elimination of existing programs, and all proposals concerning additions or modifications that seem significantly to involve more than one College or School of the University, including interdisciplinary minors whose program requirements draw from more than one College/School.

   b. The various classes shall then be handled as follows:

      (1) Class 1 - The Committee Chairperson may approve them, or submit them to the Undergraduate Programs Committee for action.
(2) Class 2 - The Committee Chairperson may use campus mail, e-mail, and/or telephone conversations to determine whether a majority of the Committee approves the proposal in question, or submit such proposals at a meeting of the Undergraduate Programs Committee.

(3) Class 3 - The Committee Chairperson must submit such proposals to the Undergraduate Programs Committee at a meeting open to all University students, staff, and faculty. Whenever such a proposal is to be considered by the Undergraduate Programs Committee, the Chairperson shall give advance notice to Chairpersons of those departments whose proposals are to be considered.

6. Proposals that concern the addition of undergraduate programs shall be routed as follows:
   a. Originated by the individual faculty members who desire to offer the program;
   b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Department;
   c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the College or School;
   d. Reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Programs Committee of the Curriculum Council, as appropriate;
   e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;
   f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;
   g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost to be reviewed for conformance to institutional priorities and mission.

7. Justification for new programs: The proposal for each new program shall include the Form 92 and the New Program Request Form (required format for submission to Illinois Board of Higher Education) with statements providing rationale for the program, evidence of communication with other Departments, Colleges, or Schools that might be interested in the program, and evidence of collation or consultation with any other Colleges or Schools with which the program subject matter overlaps.

8. Proposals that concern the modification or termination of undergraduate programs shall be routed as follows:
   a. Originated by the individual faculty members or department concerned;
   b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Department;
c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the College or School;

d. Reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Programs Committee of the Curriculum Council, as appropriate;

c. Reported to the Curriculum Council;

f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;

g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost for further review.

9. Justification for modified or terminated program: The proposal for each modified or terminated program should include the proper form, a Reasonable and Moderate Extension (RME) if necessary, a description of the program as modified, a listing of all changes, a list of associated Forms 90, and a rationale for the changes.

B. Undergraduate Courses Committee (UCC)

1. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Courses Committee shall be appointed from the Council members by the Council Chairperson with the approval of a majority of the Council. The term of office shall be one year; the same chairperson may not serve more than three successive terms.

2. The Chairperson of the Undergraduate Courses Committee shall appoint at least five additional members to the Committee, ensuring a simple majority of faculty is always present. Appointed faculty members need not be on the Curriculum Council. These appointments shall be approved by a majority of the Council. The term of Committee members shall be one year; they may succeed themselves, but cannot hold more than three consecutive terms. However, a representative of the Registrar’s Office shall serve as an on-going ex officio member.

3. The Undergraduate Courses Committee has the responsibility to review proposals for revision, additions, and terminations of undergraduate courses. The Committee shall act on these matters with the approval of the Curriculum Council, and call to the attention of the Council any proposed changes.

4. The Undergraduate Courses Committee shall meet at the call of the Committee Chair.

5. Procedures of the Undergraduate Courses Committee shall be as follows:

a. The primary responsibility of the Undergraduate Courses Committee is to review proposals for new courses (Form 90A) or experimental courses.

   (1) Major modifications to courses (Form 90C), which require Undergraduate Courses Committee approval, include major change in course description, level of instruction, change in pre-or co-requisites,
cross-listed course status, or other modifications that the Undergraduate Courses Committee Chair determines substantially change the course.

(2) Modifications to courses (Form 90C) that impact the status of the course with respect to the General Education requirements shall be forwarded to the General Education Committee.

(3) Modifications to courses (Form 90C) that impact a department’s senior assignment shall be forwarded to the Committee on Assessment.

(4) Elimination of courses (Form 90B) requires consideration by the Undergraduate Courses Committee.

b. The Committee Chairperson may call a meeting or may use campus mail, email, and/or telephone conversations to determine whether a majority of the committee approves the proposal in question.

6. Proposals that concern the addition, modification, or elimination of undergraduate courses shall be routed as follows:

a. Originated by the individual faculty members or department concerned;

b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the Department;

c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee of the College or School;

d. Reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Courses Committee of the Curriculum Council, as appropriate;

e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;

f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;

g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost for further review.

7. Justification for new courses:

a. The application for each new course shall include the Form 90A, a syllabus for the course, a short statement concerning the need for the course, evidence of communication with members of any other departments who might be interested in the course, and evidence of collation or consultation, if the course is cross-listed or if the subject matter is similar to, or possibly overlaps, that of another discipline.
b. Applications for course modifications require only the Form 90C, a syllabus for the course, and a brief statement justifying the change.

c. Applications to change an experimental course to a regular course must be accompanied by a brief statement concerning the success of the course and a description of the process used to evaluate it.

C. The General Education Committee

1. The voting members of the Committee shall be as follows: Nine faculty members, four from CAS, one from each of the other schools with a baccalaureate program, and one faculty member from Library and Information Services (staggered three-year terms). Two undergraduate students (one-year term), appointed by the Student Senate. The Director of General Education (or designated representative).

2. The non-voting members of the Committee (with indefinite terms) shall be as follows: the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or delegated representative), the Director of Academic Advising (or delegated representative), the University Registrar (or delegated representative), the Director of Assessment (or delegated representative), the Associate Dean of CAS in charge of scheduling.

3. The method of selection of the faculty members of the Committee shall be as follows:

   a. During the Spring term, the Dean of each School or College will appoint the required number of members and alternates.

   b. The candidates shall be presented for confirmation by the Curriculum Council and the Senate at their April meetings.

   c. For all faculty members, service on General Education Committee is for a three-year term commencing August 15th. Vacancies created in the middle of a term by resignation or inability to serve shall be filled by appointment of one of the designated alternates of the General Education Committee by the Chair of the General Education Committee until the following Spring Semester, at which time the vacancy shall be filled according to the procedure in 3. a.

4. During the Spring term, a voting member on the General Education Committee shall be designated Chair by the President of the Faculty Senate and the Chair of the Curriculum Council (whose terms begin in April of that Spring term). This selection shall be presented for confirmation by the Curriculum Council and the Senate at the same time as the slate of proposed new members of the General Education Committee. The Chair shall serve for one year and may succeed him/herself twice.

5. In meetings of the General Education Committee, the Chair shall only vote in case of a tie. The responsibilities of the Chair shall be as follows:
Faculty Senate

a. To serve as the official representative of General Education Committee as a voting member of the Curriculum Council;

b. To call meetings of the Committee (at least once per term) for the timely consideration of such matters as shall have been submitted to it;

c. To enact the Committee's oversight (see below) of the General Education Program;

6. A Secretary of the General Education Committee shall be appointed by the Chair from among the membership of the General Education Committee. The secretary shall serve for one year, and shall have the following responsibilities:

a. To keep accurate minutes of all meetings of the General Education Committee;

b. To assist the Governance Office in the maintenance of the records of the General Education Committee’s activities.

7. The General Education Committee shall meet at the call of its Chairperson. A quorum of the Committee shall be six (6)-voting members, including the Chairperson.

8. The General Education Committee bears the primary responsibility for maintaining and developing the General Education Program at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. Its responsibilities include the following:

a. To review proposals for additions, terminations, and modification of all general education courses and requirements.

b. To review proposed modifications in the General Education program and/or requirements, and to recommend them as appropriate.

c. To advise the Director of General Education concerning scheduling and content of General Education courses, and to recommend changes in the scheduling or content of courses where appropriate.

d. To advise the Director of General Education about the need for additional courses.

e. To consider requests from students concerning general education requirements.

f. To consider any other matters that the General Education Committee believes essential to the continued success of General Education at the University, and to recommend appropriate actions.

g. To place any General Education course or requirements that the General Education Committee deems deficient in satisfying the goals established for the
relevant General Education components on probationary status for one year. If the department or unit is unable to make satisfactory amendments to the course, project, or activity, the General Education Committee, in consultation with the Provost and Director of General Education, has the authority to remove the course, project, or activity from the General Education Program.

9. All decisions of the General Education Committee are subject to review and approval by the Curriculum Council.

10. Procedures of the General Education Committee shall be as follows:

a. All proposals for the addition of general education courses shall be circulated to members one week prior to the meeting at which it is considered.

b. Representatives of the proposing Department(s), College or School(s) shall be invited to meet with the General Education Committee during the discussion portion of deliberations relating to their proposal and respond to proposed modifications.

11. Requests to propose, modify, or delete general education courses shall be routed in the following sequence:

a. Originated by the individual faculty members who desire to teach the course (or by departments in cases where the General Education Committee has requested the course);

b. Approved by the Curriculum Committee(s) of the Department(s) involved;

c. Approved by the Curriculum Committee(s) of the College or School(s) involved;

d. Reviewed and approved by the General Education Committee, as appropriate (IS courses cannot be considered by the General Education Committee until the course is approved by at least two different departments within the College of Arts and Sciences, by CAS and one other School, or by two different Schools);

e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;

f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;

g. Forwarded to the Office of the Provost for further review.

12. The General Education Committee shall have responsibility for the continuing review of the General Education program. Responsibilities include:
a. To begin a continuous review of the General Education program starting three years after students matriculate under any requirement of the new General Education program approved by the Faculty Senate in 2007-2008. The review shall be done annually in such a way that it is completed at the end of five years, when the review process shall begin again.

b. To review, in a manner determined by the Curriculum Council, the General Education program on an annual basis, with "Foundations" courses to be reviewed in the first year, "Breadth" courses in the second and third years, and "Interdisciplinary Studies" courses along with other general education requirements in the fourth year. The fifth year in the cycle shall be devoted to reviewing the entire program from a holistic and comprehensive perspective. Each year, the Committee may be augmented with additional members as needed to help with the review. These members shall be eligible to vote on Committee decisions and will serve one-year terms. They may succeed themselves, but cannot hold more than three consecutive terms.

c. To place all courses that are not re-approved in the General Education Committee's annual review on probationary status. Departments will have one year to address satisfactorily the Committee's concerns; otherwise, such courses will be removed from the lists of courses approved for General Education credit.

d. To prepare materials in support of both the annual review of undergraduate education reported through the Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP) process and any special reviews of General Education that the University shall undertake.

e. To participate with the Office of Institutional Research and Studies in any regular inventories it conducts that shall result in data pertinent to the evaluation of the General Education Program.

D. Academic Standards and Policies Committee

1. The Chairperson of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee shall be appointed from the Council members by the Council Chairperson with the approval of the majority of the Council. The term of office shall be for one year; Chairpersons may succeed themselves, but cannot serve more than three successive terms.

2. The Chairperson of Academic Standards and Policies Committee shall appoint at least three additional members to the Committee, ensuring a simple majority of faculty is always present. These appointments shall be approved by a majority of the Council. The term of office shall be one year; the same member may not serve more than three successive terms. However, a representative of the Registrar’s Office shall serve as an on-going ex officio member.
3. The Chairperson of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee shall serve as a liaison to other committees within the University, which deal with academic standards and policies (for example, Graduate Council, Special Task Forces, Textbook Services Advisory Committee).

4. The Academic Standards and Policies Committee has the following responsibilities: to review existing standards and policies (such as grading, suspension, admission, adding and dropping classes); to recommend changes in existing standards and policies for the purpose of improving the quality of instruction.

E. Graduation Appeals Committee (GA)

1. A member of the University Registrar's staff shall serve as the non-voting Chairperson of the Graduation Appeals Committee.

2. In addition to the Chairperson, the Committee shall include three members of the faculty appointed annually by the Committee Chairperson and approved by the Curriculum Council. Committee members may succeed themselves, but may not serve for more than three consecutive terms.

3. For liaison purposes, a member of the Curriculum Council shall be appointed by the Chair of the Curriculum Council to serve as a non-voting member of the Graduation Appeals Committee. This appointment is for three years; reappointment is permitted.

4. The Graduation Appeals Committee shall hear appeals from undergraduate students who seek exceptions to the University general graduation requirements in order to graduate, and shall render decisions in such cases.

5. The Graduation Appeals Committee shall report to the Curriculum Council annually, via the Curriculum Council liaison.

F. Director of Assessment

1. The Director of Assessment shall be selected and approved by the Provost, only from among those names submitted by a Search Advisory Committee. The Search Advisory Committee shall consist of five faculty members, including the Committee Chairperson, appointed by the Curriculum Council in consultation with the Provost. The Search Advisory Committee shall submit the names of at least two acceptable applicants to the Provost, or meet with the Provost if it determines that fewer than two applicants are acceptable to the Committee. The term of office of the Director of Assessment shall be three years and the Director may serve no more than three successive terms. The Director is eligible for reappointment by the Provost pending recommendation from the Curriculum Council.

2. The Director shall serve as an ad hoc member of the Curriculum Council and shall be a voting member of the Council.
3. The Director is responsible for reviewing undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, including their courses. The Director is responsible for making recommendations to the Curriculum Council on the basis of such reviews. The Director is also responsible for assisting the Committee on Assessment in implementing the Assessment Plan.

4. Regarding the program review process, the duties of the Director shall be:

   a. Direct program review for the purpose of assessing program quality and identifying areas that need improvement.

   b. Prepare the necessary instruments for obtaining data from the program director, the faculty, current students, and recent graduates.

   c. Set the timetable and deadlines for completion of reviews.

   d. Select members for review committees.

   e. Conduct orientation meetings for program review committees.

   f. Meet with program director and faculty of departments being reviewed to discuss review process and outline steps for completing a self-study.

   g. Work closely with program directors to ensure maximum departmental involvement in the review process.

   h. Screen and hire applicants for graduate assistants and/or student workers.

   i. Supervise activities of graduate assistants and/or student workers.

   j. Serve as a liaison between reviewers and programs under review.

   k. Set up schedule for interviews of faculty and students in cooperation with the program director.

   l. Reproduce and distribute completed departmental self-studies to review committees.

   m. Direct the completion of program review reports from the review committees.

   n. Present completed reports to the Curriculum Council for approval.

   o. Submit reports to the Provost for review and action, as necessary.

   p. Serve as liaison to the Office of the Provost.
Faculty Senate

q. Work in consultation with the Curriculum Council, the Committee on Assessment, the General Education Committee, and the Director of General Education to coordinate the assessment of the General Education Program.

5. The Director is responsible for assisting the Committee on Assessment in implementing the SIUE Assessment Plan. The duties of the Director shall be to serve as ex-officio member of the Committee on Assessment, and to assist the Committee on Assessment in its charge.

G. Committee on Assessment

1. The functions of the Committee on Assessment include:
   a. Implementing the University Assessment Plan.
   b. Making further policy recommendations that may arise in the implementation process to the Curriculum Council.
   c. Maintaining the Assessment and Senior Assignment Programs.
   d. Approving undergraduate program assessment plans.
   e. Approving changes to undergraduate program assessment plans and/or related courses.
   f. Making recommendations to the Curriculum Council as warranted by the findings of assessment activities.
   g. Consulting with the Director of General Education, Director of Assessment, and the Office of the Provost regarding general education assessment.

2. Membership
   a. Members of the Committee on Assessment shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Provost.
   b. The Committee on Assessment shall be constituted of eight faculty members, one of whom will be a liaison from the Curriculum Council; two undergraduate students, and one representative from each of the following: the Office of Institutional Research, the Director of Assessment, the Associate Provost for Academic Planning, Assessment, and Accreditation, Learning Support Services, and the Academic Deans.
   c. Appointments to the Committee shall normally be for three-year terms; reappointment is permitted for a maximum of three successive terms. All members of the Committee are voting members.
d. The Chairperson of the Committee shall be appointed from among the Committee membership, by the Faculty Senate President in consultation with the Provost. The term of office as Chairperson shall be one year; reappointment of the same individual to additional terms is permitted indefinitely.

H. Director of General Education

1. The Director of General Education shall be selected and approved by the Provost, only from among those names submitted by a Search Advisory Committee. The Search Advisory Committee shall consist of five faculty members, including the Committee Chairperson, appointed by the Curriculum Council in consultation with the Provost. The Search Advisory Committee shall submit the names of at least two acceptable applicants to the Provost, or meet with the Provost if it determines that fewer than two applicants are acceptable to the Committee. The term of office of the Director of General Education shall be three years and the Director may serve no more than three successive terms. The Director is eligible for reappointment by the Provost pending recommendation from the Curriculum Council.

2. The Director shall serve as a voting member of the Curriculum Council and the General Education Committee.

3. The Director has administrative responsibility for the effective functioning of the General Education program, including the First Semester Transition Course and ES courses, to ensure high quality offerings and achievement of purpose.

4. The Director shall communicate to departments the need for additional courses deemed necessary to the General Education curriculum.

5. The Director shall assist and advise the General Education Committee in their work.

6. The Director will work, in consultation with the Curriculum Council, the Committee on Assessment, the General Education Committee, and the Director of Assessment, to coordinate the assessment of the General Education program.

VI. Ad Hoc Committees

The Chair of the Council may from time to time create ad hoc committees with the approval of the Council. The nature of the Committees, their duties, estimated life, and the voting status of the Chairpersons of these committees shall all be subject to approval by the Council.

VII. Amendment Recommendations

Recommended amendments to the Operating Papers may be made by two-thirds of Council members present and are subject to approval by the Faculty Senate. Previous notice of the proposed amendment(s) must have been circulated to members one week prior to the meeting at which it is considered.
Proposed Policy to address professional development around diversity for the University community

Preamble: Southern Illinois University Edwardsville is committed to recognizing and valuing the contributions of the breadth of humankind. SIUE recognizes that each member of the University is responsible for contributing to an environment that is open, respectful, and welcoming. Such responsibility requires that all employees and students understand the history, importance, and aspects of diversity at SIUE and the community it serves. To this end, SIUE provides different professional development opportunities, including Diversity Day, workshops and cultural tours throughout the year for all SIUE employees and students. Increased participation and involvement in these professional development events is essential for employees to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill SIUE’s diversity and inclusion goals as outlined in the new 7-year Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. This policy provides guidance to encourage such participation.

- All employees shall have the opportunity to participate in at least one University-sponsored diversity and inclusion event each academic year.
- Employees wishing to participate in an event that might require some adjustment of their regular work duties or schedule may request professional development release time. Employees requesting release time shall provide a statement to their immediate supervisors at least two weeks before the event. Such a statement shall include:
  - The nature and scope of the event and how it would aid professional development;
  - The scheduled date and time;
  - Suggested arrangements made for work to proceed while the employee is gone.
- Supervisors shall make concerted efforts to ensure staff members’ participation in diversity and inclusion events.

Process for delivery to University Policy Council

1. Associate Chancellor and Chair of the University Diversity Council will discuss with Chancellor Pembrook
2. Proposed policy to be discussed again in University Diversity Council on November 9, 2018
3. University Diversity Council Policy Committee will take proposal to Expanded Chancellors Council in December
4. Proposal to come back to University Diversity Council for discussion and modifications if needed
5. Proposal to be shared with University Community for open dialogue
6. Proposal to be submitted to University Policy Council

Developed by the University Diversity Council on September 4, 2018
Discussed with Chancellor Pembrook on November 5, 2018
Report from Welfare Council Meeting
March

- Welfare Council met on March 21, 2019

- Jamie Ball, Phyleccia Reed-Cole, and Tom Jordan attended the meeting as guests. The council had invited them to provide guidance and information in light of the council’s recent work looking into anti-bullying policies. The council also discussed potential non-policy avenues for addressing faculty-to-faculty bullying.

- At the request of a faculty senator, the council discussed the University of Chicago’s Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression. Given SIUE’s existing policy (6E1), the council opted not to take further action on the University of Chicago statement at the present time.