The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 2:30pm on Thursday, April 7, 2019 in Mississippi/Illinois Room of the Morris University Center by President Nastasia.

Present:
Sorin Nastasia, Jocelyn DeGroot Brown, Marcus Agustin, Undrah Baasanjav, Jeff Banker, Kathryn Bentley, Kathryn Brady, Stacey Brown, Elizabeth Cali, Kim Carter, Igor Crk, Cristina De Meo, John Foster, Hernando Garcia, Lisa Green, Debra Jenkins, Stephen Kerber, Marie Klopfenstein, Erik Krag, Faith Liebl, Yuliang Liu, Nima Lotfi Yagin, Andy Lozowski, Nancy Lutz, Frank Lyerla, Barbara McCracken, Debbie Mann, Adriana Martinez, Shadrack Msengi, Edward Navarre, Kate Newman, Junvie Pailden, Vince Rapini, Brad Reed, Laurie Rice, Dan Segrist, Kamran Shavezipur, Michael Shaw, Walter Siganga, Joseph Sokolowski, Emily Truckenbrod, Yadong Wang, Duff Wrobbel

Absent:
Jane Barrow, Rakesh Bharati, Ayse Evrensel, Tom Foster, Tim Jacks, Jennifer Miller, Jonathan Pettibone, Ann Popkess, Jeffrey Sabby, Jared Sheley, Bin Zhou

Excused:
Lakesha Butler, Wai Cheah, Laura Fowler, Andrew Gross, Susan Wiediger (ex officio)

Guests:
Tom Jordan, Eric Ruckh

Announcements:
Announcements were reviewed as listed on the agenda. Tom Jordan was present to give an overview of the policy revisions to 1Q5 (Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research and Academic Misconduct) and 1Q9 (Conflicts of Interest and Commitment).

1Q9 was revised via the Graduate Council with advisement from Legal Counsel and is an ongoing update checking for language and compliance. The revised policy with changes tracked was posted to SharePoint and is attached. The floor was opened to questions, but there were none.

The previous policy 1Q5 was eliminated and replaced with the new version, prompted by new requirements from Public Health Services. In order to stay eligible for funding, the University had to align policy with their requirements. PHS provided a model policy which served as a base for the new policy, and the initial draft went to ERP and Grad Council before a slightly revised version was sent to Policy Council. The substantial differences are enhancements to due process as this is a very explicit and detailed process which involves the accused much earlier in the process. If the allegation is shown to be unfounded, the University will take restorative steps to clear the person’s name. The floor was opened to questions. Students are only affected by this policy if they are working under a grant covered by this policy, and any other student issues would be addressed under the student policy. If there was a violation and the granting agency requested some kind of restitution the University would provide the
restitution to remain in compliance, however individual cases would be decided on a case-by-case basis. There was a discussion on training, sources of information, and possible seminars to help understand the requirements as well as having senators take the information back to their schools.

**Guest Speaker:**
Honors Program Director Eric Ruckh provided an introduction and update on where the program has been and where it is going. The process has gone smoother than hoped, and Dr. Ruckh thanked the Faculty Senate for support.

There are currently 434 students in the new program and 550 Honors students on campus, which is about 4.8% of the undergraduate population. 70 finalists for the Meridian Scholarship have committed to coming to SIUE, and another 65 applications have come in for Fall 2019. The demographics of the program were shared, and the budget for the program was reviewed.

The program is in the process of hiring an Assistant Director. One of the duties of this new position will be to specifically work with maintaining the diversity of the Honors Program. Two finalists will be visiting campus, and the person is expected to begin work in summer. Other initiatives include a guaranteed admissions track to SIU Law for SIUE Honors students and an accelerated STEM/MBA option for Honors students.

The program started with 6 courses, and this year they have 51 with more projected next year. The Honors Program is an alternative to the Lincoln Program, and the growing curriculum has seen more faculty coming forward to teach courses. They are collecting data about graduation rates from the program, but no one in the new program has graduated yet. The data will continue to be tracked to see what happens once students start emerging from the program next year.

The assessment of the program will be finalized in AY19/20, with a self-study in AY20/21 and external review in AY21/22. They are working with LCCC Honors College to develop an articulation agreement between the two programs for seamless transfer of their students into SIUE’s program. They are also looking at ways to integrate the University Honors Advisory Council (UHAC) into the Faculty Senate, which seems to be best placed under the Curriculum Council.

The long-term goal is to have a serious conversation on whether it would be beneficial for SIUE to have an Honors College. The data will be available in a few years to start the conversation.

**Consideration of Minutes:**
The minutes for the March 7, 2019 meeting were approved as written.

**Action Items:**
The second reading of Policy 111 Credit for Prior Learning took place. The floor was opened to questions, and there were none. There was a motion and second to approve the policy, and it was approved unanimously.
**Unfinished Business:**
There was no unfinished business.

**New Business:**
The first reading of the Curriculum Council Operating Papers was heard. The papers have not been updated since 2011, however there have been many curriculum changes. The changes include more flexibility for the FSEC to put more members on the Council, adaptions in approval processes to account for the use of CurricUNET, and allowing a longer term for staff appointees. The papers will come for a second reading and vote at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

There was a discussion about CurricUNET and the resulting changes in process and challenges. Departments can now track the progress of curriculum changes in CurricUNET. There have been some issues with advising not aware of catalog changes, so steps have been taken to ensure that everyone is using the updated catalog.

**Reports from Standing Committees:**
The UPBC met with Vice Chancellor Rachel Stack on March 1, and with Vice Chancellor Rich Walker on March 29. The next meeting will be Friday, April 5 to do the second round of innovation grant reviews. There was a complaint that the UPBC was not providing minutes in a timely fashion, so the minutes from the January and March UPBC meetings were posted to SharePoint and are attached. The website is now current through the end of 2018.

The IBHE report was posted to SharePoint and is attached.

**Reports from Council Chairs:**
On behalf of the Faculty Development Council, Msengi thanked everyone for spreading the word about the Continuous Improvement Conference. Over 90 people were in attendance.

Paiden reported for the Rules and Procedures Council. The committee is preparing the annual reviews of the Chancellor and Provost. 500 surveys were sent, and 112 reviewed the Chancellor while 108 reviewed the Provost. The report will be brought to the Faculty Senate once it has been reviewed by the Chancellor and Provost. A written report was also posted to SharePoint and is attached.

Curriculum Council, Welfare Council, Graduate Council and Past-President reports were posted to SharePoint and are attached. The President Elect had no report.

The President posted a report to SharePoint, and it is attached. He met with the Chancellor today for a meeting of the constituency heads. There were questions about the Board of Trustees and the AGB report, and a brief discussion took place. The new SIU President search was supposed to take place over the summer with someone in place by August, however the search has been pushed forward to allow time for the system to determine what it wants in a President. SIUE has better representation on the search committee, however the final decision is up to the Board of Trustees.
Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 3:56pm.

Submitted by Anne Hunter, University Governance
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Mississippi/Illinois Rooms, Morris University Center
April 4, 2019 – 2:30 p.m.
AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. GUESTS
   a. Honors Program Director Eric Ruckh

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Faculty Senate meetings, Spring 2019, guest speakers:
      i. 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. Board of Trustee meetings:
      i. May 16 – SIUC
      ii. July 18 – Springfield
   d. Important events:
      i. Faculty and Staff Appreciation Day – April 17
   e. Policy revisions:
      i. Policy Council revision of 1Q5 Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research and Academic Misconduct
      ii. Policy Council revision of 1Q9 Conflicts of Interest and Commitment (Tom Jordan will be present to provide clarifications)

IV. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
   a. March 7, 2019

V. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Second Reading – Policy 1i11 Credit for Prior Learning

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS
   a. First Reading – Curriculum Council Operating Papers
VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
   a. UPBC – Nancy Lutz
   b. IBHE Faculty Advisory Council – Shelly Goebl-Parker

IX. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL CHAIRS
   a. Faculty Development Council – Shadrack Msengi
   b. Curriculum Council – Laurie Rice
   c. Rules & Procedures Council – Wai Cheah
   d. Welfare Council – Dan Segrist
   e. Graduate Council – Ed Navarre
   f. Past-President – Marcus Agustin
   g. President-Elect – Jocelyn DeGroot
   h. President – Sorin Nastasia

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Thursday, May 2, 2018 at 2:30 p.m. in the Mississippi/Illinois Rooms, Morris University Center
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Replaced 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 for 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 9C2 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 interpretation, 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 (DRIO)** 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 DRIO for SIUE is the Associate Dean for Research. In the event the DRIO 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 clearly 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 subawardees, 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 email 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.

Preponderance 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 93, 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 reviewing 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 research or academic 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, assignment 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:
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- 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. Advisors

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 proceedings.

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.
- Request 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 proceedings.
- 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") to 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 removal, 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 proceedings. 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**

6
C. **Notice to Respondent, Initial Sequestration of Research Records and Submission**

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 limited 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 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. **Change 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 § 93.304(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
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draft 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 RIO may revise the draft report as appropriate and prepare it in final form.

B. Institutional Decision and Notification

1. Decision by Deciding 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 RUP 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 charges 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 7 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 CRI 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 change 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 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.

B. 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 RIO 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 RIO will request an extension from the DO. The RIO 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 the misconduct falsification, fabrication, 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.

3. **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.

4. **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.

5. **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.

6. **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,
evidence or clarification requested by ORI or other agency to carry out its review of an allegation of research misconduct or of SIUE’s handling of such an allegation.

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
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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.
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Conflicts of Interest and Commitment - I.Q9

The teaching, research, and service mission of SUUK 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 employer’s participation in both public and private outside activities. Employees must ensure that their outside obligations, financial interests, and activities do not conflict or serve to advance their interests beyond 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 resolving actual and potential conflicts of interest and commitment. This policy applies to all sponsored projects, employment outside SUUK, and volunteer activities. Certain provisions apply only to employees receiving funding from the Public Health Service (PHS) and other entities requiring financial conflict of interest disclosures. Additional guidance is provided in Administrative Professional and Civil Service staff in the Human Resources website at https://www.suuk.edu/hr/administrative-professional-and-civil-service-staff/ and https://www.suuk.edu/hr/financial-relationships/conflicts-of-interest/

I. General Principles:

A. Employees must arrange their external obligations and financial interests so as not to impair or conflict with their duties and responsibilities to the University.

B. Unless otherwise exempted by existing 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 Conflict of Interest Statement in 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 and the employee 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 interests or commitments incompatible with the University. An interest incompatible with the University includes but is not limited to any commitment between an employee and external entity:

1. that may restrict or impair the employee’s ability to perform his/her activities at the University;
2. that results in the transfer or compromise of teaching or potential university rights in intellectual property;
3. that results in an employment without prior written approval of the University.

F. Changes in conflicts of this policy shall be carefully examined. Changes shall be processed in the normal reporting channels. Disciplinary actions 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, membership, 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, partner, domestic partner's children, 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. deringing or outside market 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 influence 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 employee's activities for personal gain or unauthorized use
6. negotiating or influencing the negotiation of grants and contracts with organizations with which the University has a consulting or other significant relationships
7. accepting gratuities or special favors from private organizations with which the University does or may conduct business
8. extending privileges 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 Commitments

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

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

C. Under Illinois law and University Policy, "Policy on Outside Employment for Faculty, Research Faculty, and Staff," 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 consulting services from any external person or organization. Further, the law requires prospective reporting through the filing of an annual statement by the employee, indicating the amount of actual time spent on such outside research or consulting services.

D. These are two principles that broadly govern conflict of commitments:

1. An employee of the University, the individual's commitment and obligation to the University must take priority over the commitments to outside interests.
Unacceptable conflicts of commitment include but are not limited to the following:

3. **Commitment of Time:** Ordinarily, University employees 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 engage 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 research labs, classrooms, and meeting spaces) and University staff (such as instrumental support of programs and computing infrastructure). These facilities and other assets may be used in outside activities with the University's written 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 prototypical or non-employees 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 involved.

6. **Intellectual Property:** No University employee may claim or transfer rights to patents, licenses, or copyrights of scholarly activity supported by the University to any external agency. Patents or copyrights or other proprietary rights must be shared by the University in accordance with arrangements set forth in the employee-employer contract and pursuant to the University's Intellectual Property Policy. (See University Policy 1363)

7. **Use of the University's Name:** The individual as well as outside entities may not use the university's name without prior university approval.

II. **Conflicts of Commitment:** The University expects its employees to maintain a high level of integrity in their professional and personal conduct. To this end, the University has established policies and procedures to ensure that its employees' personal and professional activities do not conflict with the University's interests. Failure to comply with these policies and procedures can result in disciplinary action, including but not limited to termination of employment.
6. Transferring technology to an outside firm for personal gain of
   government-sponsored work products, checks, materials, records, or
   information that are not made generally available to a private individual
   or organization for personal gain. This requirement would not
   necessarily prevent appropriate licensing arrangements for inventions or
   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
   proprietary/confidential information acquired in connection with the
   employee’s government-sponsored activities. (The term
   proprietary/confidential information includes but is not limited to
   medical, personnel, and security records of individuals anticipated
   material requirements or price 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 relationships.

9. Accepting gratuities or special favors from private organizations with
   which the University does or may conduct business in connection with a
   sponsored project and extenuation of gratuities or special favors to
   employers of the employee under circumstances which might reasonably
   be interpreted as an attempt to influence the recipient in the conduct of
   their duties.

IV. Distribution of Effort

   a. The way in which an employee divides effort among the various job functions and
   responsibilities does not raise ethical questions unless the employee supporting a
   project is noted in its understanding of the amount of intellectual effort an
   employee is actually devoting to the research in question. A system of precise time
   accounting is incompatible with the inherent character of the work of a faculty
   member because the various functions performed are closely interwoven and do not
   conform to any meaningful division of a standard work week. On the other hand, if
   the project agreement contemplates that an employee will devote a constant fraction of
   effort to the sponsored project or the employee agrees to assume responsibility in
   relation to such project, a demonstrable relationship between the indicated effort or
   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 Statute (18 U.S.C. 202-209 as amended) and all other provisions
   governing special government employees. (See, for example, the United States Office
   of Government 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 his 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 insofar
   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 as a
   contractor 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 is an evaluator of a competitor to such other organization.

VI. Systems Requiring Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure (FCOI)
   A. Certain sponsors, including the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS), which oversees agencies such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH), require the University and its employees to establish and follow guidelines for recognizing, disclosing, and managing actual and potential significant financial conflicts of interest in relation to the sponsored project. This policy promotes objectivity 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.
   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 lead an independent observer to reasonably question whether the design, conduct, or reporting of the funded project might be influenced by the possibility of financial gain.
      2. Immediate family for FCOI means an investigator’s spouse, co-investigator, and any other person who receives directly or indirectly more than half of his or her support from the investigator or from whom the investigator receives directly or indirectly more than half of his or her 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 an investigator’s professional responsibilities on behalf of UIUC, 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 or those of his/her immediate family that reasonably appears 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 option, and ownership interest.
         a. A SFI exists in relation to a publicly traded entity if the value of any remuneration received in the 12 months preceding the disclosure and the value of any equity interest in the entity total to exceed $5,000.
         b. A SFI exists in relation to non-publicly traded entities when the value of remuneration exceeds $100 or when the investigator and his/her family hold any equity interest or 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 investigator travel related to his or her institutional responsibilities. Reimbursement 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 interests:
d. salary, royalties or other remuneration paid by SIUE to the investigator for appropriate grant and contract activity
a. intellectual property rights assigned to SIUE 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 directly control the investment decision made in these vehicles
b. income from service, lectures or teaching engagements sponsored by SIUE, a federal, state, or local agency or institution of higher education, or an academic hospital, medical center or research institute affiliated with a university
h. income from service to advisory committees or review panels associated with the same agency as identified in item a above.

C. Financial Disclosures

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

1. bias is found with the design, conduct or reporting of the project or
2. an investigator fails to comply with applicable University, POCI, policy or a POCI management plan or
3. a POCI management plan appears to have biased the design, conduct, or reporting of the funded project

Any conflict 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 if SPIs not disclosed in a timely manner or previously reviewed or whenever an POCI is not identified or managed in a timely manner. For additional information, please refer to the University’s Financial Disclosures Process.

The University will comply with all applicable public disclosure requirements. See the online guidance regarding public accessibility for written response 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 reviewed by the Graduate School as necessary. Additional guidance is provided on the Human Resources website https://humanresources.purdue.edu/ and https://www.purdue.edu/humanresources/policies-and-procedures.htm. For additional information, please refer to the University’s Financial Disclosures Process.

E. Training

Each investigator must complete POCI training prior to engaging in a project requiring POCI disclosure. Investigators must complete training every 4 years and immediately when any of the following occur:
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1. The University firms the investigator noncompliant with the 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 program report to the funding agency). Before departing or retiring at any University facility, contact the University's Office of Records Management for any additional State records retention requirements.

G. Sanctions

Charges of violations of this policy shall be carefully examined. Charges shall be processed in the normal reporting channel. 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 NIH/NIDCD-funded research project of clinical research whose purpose is to evaluate the safety of off-label use of a drug, medical device, or treatment has been designed, conducted, or reported by an investigator with a FCOI that was not managed or reported by the University, as required by regulation, the investigator shall:

1. Disclose the FCOI in each public presentation of the results of the research.
2. Request additional support from previously published presentations.

VII. Permissible Activities (pending appropriate approval)

A. Employees may accept stipends for published works and patent and honorary for papers and lectures pursuant to University policy. For FCOI, such acceptance shall be subject to the FCOI Policy or other University policies.

B. Employees may accept payments for consulting an outside entity provided that the time commitment does not exceed 20% of the time and the arrangement does not violate the University's conflict of interest policies.

C. Employees may serve on boards and committees of outside entities that do not interact with the faculty member's obligation to the University.

VIII. University Responsibility

A. The University shall make known to the sponsor:

1. Any known or suspected conflicts of interest or other potential conflicts of interest, unless otherwise required by applicable law or University policy.
2. The University's reporting requirements and the deadlines for reporting.
3. The University's efforts to resolve any conflicts of interest or other potential conflicts of interest.

B. To the extent permitted by applicable law or University policy, the University shall report the following:

1. Any known or suspected conflicts of interest.
2. The University's efforts to resolve any conflicts of interest.
3. The University's requirements for reporting any potential conflicts of interest.

C. The University shall provide information to the sponsor about the University's efforts to resolve any conflicts of interest.
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.

The above process of development and obfuscation is the obligation assumed by the University when it accepts funds for projects. The process must, of course, be carried on in a manner that does not conflict with the legitimate freedom and dignity of individual employees. It is desirable that standards and procedures on the hand established be formulated and administered by members of the university community themselves, through their own councils and responsibility, for those who are the users and judges of the conditions which can more effectively stimulate the search for knowledge and pursue the expansion of productive freedom. Experience indicates that such standards and procedures should be developed and specified by more administrative- 

duty actions.

Approved by Chancellor office 9/9/13.
This policy was issued on September 10, 2015, replacing the September 15, 2014 version
Document Reference: [95]
Origin: GC 3/1/96; GR 12/12/98; GC 9/9/13
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Credit for Prior Learning – Policy 1111

Students who have acquired knowledge and/or skills as a result of prior learning or professional experiences may earn course credit through prior learning assessment (PLA). PLA may include credit by exam, individualized assessment, evaluation of workplace training, portfolios, and other means as deemed appropriate by the evaluating department. PLA may be obtained for

- workplace training,
- military training (see Military Prior Learning Credit – 1.Q4),
- holding current licenses or industry recognized certifications,
- Advanced Placement (see Advanced Placement Program and International Baccalaureate Credit – 1K2),
- Proficiency exams (see Undergraduate Proficiency Examination Policy – 1K4),
- College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams (see College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Policy – 1K5),
- Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES/DSST, see https://www.siue.edu/transfer/credit/dantes-dsst-credit.shtml),
- American Council on Education (ACE) courses and programs,
- other activities that demonstrate mastery of appropriate college level course outcomes.

A student should consult with the department from which PLA credit is sought to discuss credit for prior learning experiences. Credit is awarded provided the student demonstrates that learning occurred as a result of the prior experience. Credit is not awarded for the experience itself. There may be a fee for PLA imposed based on the type of assessment and number of credits to be reviewed. When appropriate, fees will be assessed according to University policy and will be disclosed prior to review of prior learning. PLA academic credit will only be awarded for admitted students. Earned PLA credits may satisfy prerequisite requirements and apply toward general education requirements, majors, minors, and electives. A student cannot earn PLA credit if the student has earned a grade for a course.

Unsuccessful attempts to earn PLA credit will not be included in the student’s transcript. A student can request a review of the PLA decision by filing an appeal with the Department Chair of the department evaluating the prior learning.
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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.
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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 online.

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 doctoral 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)
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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 ongoing 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 as policy recommendations.

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.
   
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
Faculty Senate

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 by 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 02 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 consultation 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;
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e. Reported to the Curriculum Council;
f. Reported to the Faculty Senate;
i. 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 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, changes in pre- or co-requisites, cross-listed course status, or other modifications that the Undergraduate Courses Committee Chair determines substantially change the course.
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(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.

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

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

(6)

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. 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 Dean 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:
   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;
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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 (if 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.
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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 list 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)
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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.
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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.

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 SUF 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.
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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
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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 IS 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.

Approved by the Interim Chancellor November 20, 2015
Approved by Faculty Senate October 1, 2015 (CC#04-15/16)

Approved by the Chancellor December 16, 2013
Approved by Faculty Senate November 7, 2013 (CC#25-13/14)
Approved by the Chancellor January 24, 2013
Approved by Faculty Senate December 6, 2012 (CC#11-12/13)

Approved by Curriculum Council 01/20/11
Approved by Faculty Senate 03/03/11
Approved by the Chancellor 05/20/11
University Planning and Budget Council
Unapproved Minutes
Friday, January 18, 2019
Chancellor’s Conference Room
10:30 a.m.

Members Present

Marcus Agustin
Rakesh Bharati
Cindy Cobetto
Gretchen Fricke
Ken Holbert
Cem Karacal
Nancy Lutz (Chair)

Randy Pembroke (ex officio)
Ann Popkess
Mackenzie Rogers
Jeffrey Sabby
Sadie Spears
Bill Winter (ex officio)

Members Absent

Lakesha Butler
Ashley Cameron

Guests:

Denise Cobb
James Schram

I. Call to Order
   The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m.

II. Additions to the Agenda
   There were no additions to the agenda.

III. Approval of December 7, 2018 meeting minutes
   The December 7, 2018 meeting minutes were approved as written.

IV. Announcements
   There were no announcements.

V. New Business
   a. Academic Affairs update presentation: Provost Cobb gave a PowerPoint presentation: “Academic Affairs Update to UPBC, Winter 2019.” The presentation outlined the Academic Affairs FY 2020 Updates, discussed for consideration funding for future initiatives, and addressed important issues going forward.
   b. Other New Business
      There was no other new business.
VI. Adjournment

*The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.*

Next Meeting: March 1, 2019 at 10:30 am in the Chancellor’s Conference Room
University Planning and Budget Council
Unapproved Minutes
Friday, March 1, 2019
Chancellor’s Conference Room
10:30 a.m.

Members Present

Marcus Agustin
Rakesh Bharati
Lakesha Butler
Ashley Cameron
Ken Holbert
Cem Karacal
Nancy Lutz (Chair)
Randy Pembrook (ex officio)
Ann Popkess
Mackenzie Rogers
Jeffrey Sabby
Bill Winter (ex officio)

Members Absent

Cindy Cobetto
Gretchen Fricke
Sadie Spears

Guest:

Rachel Stack

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:34 a.m.

II. Additions to the Agenda

There were no additions to the agenda.

III. Approval of January 18, 2019 meeting minutes

The January 18, 2019 meeting minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

IV. Announcements

a. Chancellor’s Announcements
   i. The next BOT meeting will be March 27/28 in Springfield.
   ii. Discussed the CHAPA process.
   iii. Led a discussion about the minimum wage increase.

b. Other Announcements
   There were no other announcements.

V. New Business
a. Budget requests for University Advancement: Vice Chancellor Stack gave a PowerPoint presentation: “Presentation to UPBC.” The presentation focused on fundraising highlights, an update on operation needs, upcoming events, and what SIUE Advancement needs from UPBC.

b. Other New Business
   There was no other new business.

VI. Adjournment
   The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Next Meeting: March 29, 2019 at 10:30 am in the Chancellor's Conference Room
The draft minutes are attached, though they may have revisions. If that happens I will send the amended version.

It was an interesting meeting, with conversation with St. Xavier’s President, Dr. Laurie M. Joyner. Her remarks are worth reading and are well summarized in the minutes.

We also had a Zoom visit with Mary l. Vanis, Vice President for Accreditation Relations of the Higher Learning Commission. This conversation was initiated to ask for support for the current struggle in IL concerning Dual Credit Teacher qualifications. We had a really engaged discussion.

Current Illinois legislation concerning Dual Credit is causing a great deal of concern as it states that a K-12 School Board can determine who is a qualified teacher of a dual credit course. There is concern that these boards would not be following the HLC standards in these determinations.

Here is the link to the bill:
onID=108&GA=101

Bottom line is HLC will work on it, IBHE has been and will continue to work on trying to deal with legislators to amend and bring it in line with HLC standards for qualifying teachers of these courses. As of this email, the bill is still being moved through with no schedule for hearings currently and has been sent back to Assignments.

Decisions were made about how the FAC will manage situations when representatives have terms interrupted, say they leave their positions. The Public Caucus decided that for continuity sake, it made sense to have replacement reps simply carry out a full term. For instance: if someone is appointed to replace someone who served only two years out of three, they would simply begin a new three-year term rather than finish out the previous representative’s last year.

There are white papers being completed by working groups that should be done soon. I experienced a great deal of evidence that our own Sue March 2019 Wiediger is doing an excellent job representing SIUE very well on this advisory council.

Respectfully Submitted,
Shelly Goebl- Parker
FSCC Report
Chair: Laurie Rice
3/25/19

The curriculum council met on March 21, 2019.

The curriculum council approved draft changes to its operating papers.

The program review for the undergraduate program in Liberal Studies came before the curriculum council. After hearing from a representative from the program review team (Thad Meeks), Program Director Brian Hinterscher and CAS Associate Dean Jen Rehg, the curriculum council determined that the program is in good standing and that its enrollment is sustainable at present levels. That said, several issues merit further attention, which will be raised in the curriculum council’s letter to the Provost.

The curriculum council discussed leadership for next year.

The curriculum council approved Marc Ortega as replacement for Linda Lovata on the Graduation Appeals Committee beginning in May.

The curriculum council heard reports from its standing committees and various ex officio members. Items of note include:

- The Undergraduate Programs Committee is currently reviewing program changes to undergraduate programs in Historical Studies and Social Work.
- The Undergraduate Courses Committee had reviewed all course change proposals pending before it as of the meeting date.
- Enrollment management reports that fall admits for undergraduates are up by 4.5% compared to this time last year.

Registration is now open for Summer and Fall 2019. Catalog copy revisions must be finished by April.
Rules & Procedures Council (RPC) Report

Chair: Wai Hsien Cheah

4/4/19

The Chancellor’s and Provost’s annual evaluation (conducted via Qualtrics) closed last Wednesday (March 27, 2019) at noon. RPC received the two dataset links from Mr. Marcus Scott, and the first draft of the two annual evaluation reports are currently being prepared. While 112 faculty members reviewed the Chancellor’s performance for academic calendar year 2018-19, a total 108 faculty members participated in the review of the Provost’s performance.

The Chancellor and Provost will each get to review their respective report, and be given the opportunity to respond. The final reports (with the Chancellor’s and Provost’s comments) will be made available to members of faculty senate prior to the May meeting. Thank you.
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.
Graduate Council Report

The Graduate Council of the Faculty Senate was scheduled to meet Thursday 28 February 2019. However, the University was closed that day due to inclement weather. There was not a meeting scheduled in March due to the University closure for Spring Break. The next scheduled meeting is 11 April 2019.
President’s Report to Faculty Senate  
April 2, 2019

Constituency Heads Meeting (Friday, March 1)  
- Election of System President: the aspects discussed included SIUE’s involvement in the process, the deadlines, and the proposed job description; a question was addressed whether the new System President’s staff will be located in Carbondale or Springfield  
- Nursing Program at SIUC: Interim President already approved the application  
- Carnegie classification: we have the doctoral/professional designation until 2021; in order to get to R2, we need 10 additional doctoral students; it was discussed whether we want to become R2 considering that we would be situated towards the end of the R2 classification  
- Next Constituency Heads meeting: April 4

University Quality Council (Thursday, March 7)  
- The committee evaluated Innovation Fund proposals submitted in the current cycle; 16 projects were proposed; the committee forwarded recommendations to the Chancellor; the next step will be UPBC consideration of recommended proposals  
- SIUE’s Assurance Review is nearing completion of the final draft  
- Next UQC meeting: April 4

University Diversity Council  
- The Spring Diversity and Inclusion Summit was held in the Conference Center of MUC on Friday, March 22  
- Next University Diversity Council meeting: April 12

Strategic Planning Steering Committee  
- The Strategic Planning Steering Committee did not meet in March  
- Each Strategic Planning Steering Committee member is a liaison to a strategic planning goal work group  
- The various work groups are holding ongoing meetings to discuss the goals, contribute ideas for changes to the goals, and establishing goal dashboards

Faculty/Staff Appreciation Day Committee  
- The event, named Beach Bash 19, will take place on April 17 in the MUC  
- There will be various informational and entertaining activities as well as raffles and prizes
Board of Trustees Meeting (SIU School of Medicine, Springfield, Thursday, March 28)

- BoT Chair Phil Gilbert stated that there was an agreement among all members of the SIU leadership that SIU is stronger as a system, but that more coordinated strategic planning is needed to define the system’s mission, vision, and goals.

- New Nursing Program in Carbondale will be part of the School of Health Sciences.

- Carbondale recently celebrated its 150th birthday.

- From Chancellor Pembrook’s report:
  - Freshmen applications are up 13% (approximately 1,100 people);
  - ACT scores for Freshmen are averaged at 23.7;
  - Transfers are up 3%;
  - Graduate admissions have doubled;
  - School of Pharmacy is ranked 19th nationwide; School of Nursing is ranked 25th nationwide.

- Members of the SIUE Faculty Association (FA) had a presence to raise awareness about the slow bargaining process of a negotiated contract with the administration; the following points were made:
  - Kim Archer: SIUE has accumulated $27 million in savings, but is not currently willing to allocate part of it for salary increases; $255,000 would cover 1% increase in salaries of all faculty represented by FA.
  - Marie Klopfenstein: the Salary Equity Committee has determined that SIUE employees are not paid competitively for the region.