

**University Graduate Council**  
**November 13, 2020**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Eric Berlatsky, A&L; Mahyar Shirazi, Medicine; Anita Pennathur, Business; Paul Peluso, UGC Chair; Ali Danesh, Education; Mihaela Cardei, Engineering; Francisco Presuel-Moreno, Engineering; David Newman, Nursing; Christopher Beetle, Science; Marianne Porter, Science.

**Others Present:** Brian Farrell, Graduate College; Robert Stackman, Graduate College; Aaron Tramp, Graduate College; Bridget Smith, Medicine; William Kalies, Science; Tamara Dinev, Business; Brian Hodge, Registrar.

**Absent:** Clifford Brown, A&L; Manny Gonzalez, Dawn Frood, Library; CSWCJ; Karina Cruz, GPSA.

- I.** The UGC meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by UGC Chair, Paul Peluso.
- II.** No announcements.
- III.** The minutes from the UGC Meeting held on October 14, 2020 were unanimously approved by the Council.
- IV.** Curricula items from GPC meeting held on November 4, 2020 submitted by GPC Chair, Chris Beetle, for approval by UGC to move forward to Senate Steering meeting on November 23, 2020.
  - A. Chris moved that all agenda items from the November 4, 2020 GPC meeting be approved, with the exception of the 10 Course Change Requests for which supporting emails have not yet been received. He further moved that these 10 items be tabled until the December 16<sup>th</sup> UGC meeting and only if supporting emails have been received.
    1. Mihaela Cardei: Will this be the policy of UGC, going forward?
      - a. Chris: This is not in conflict with GPC/UGC policy. These items were approved conditionally and those conditions have not yet been met.
      - b. Chris: The support emails are for the good of the students. We don't want to have duplication of efforts by the colleges and the protect the efficient use of resources by the University.
      - c. David Newman: Do Registration Controls or Pre-Requisite changes fall under that need?
      - d. Chris: These changes affected students in CEECS and were across multiple disciplines where some students taking these courses as electives might not be in the CEECS program.
  - B. Chris' motion was seconded and the remaining items were approved to move forward to UFS Steering.
    1. A motion was made by Chris to place the Program Change for the PhD in Business Administration on the Action Agenda.
      - a. This motion was seconded and approved by the UGC.

2. All remaining items are to be placed on the Consent Agenda.
- C. Tamara Dinev: Brought up the point that any and all Course Changes in ITOM, regardless of how minor, are submitted with supporting emails from the COECS.
1. She pointed out that the College of Business has never not supported any curricula items from COECS nor tried to block them.
  2. It is not appropriate for the COECS to choose which courses need supporting emails and which do not.
- D. Mihaela: Expressed concern that her comments were taken out of context. She agreed that any courses offered, that may share content with other courses, should always get supporting emails. Of course, we should always do what is best for the students.
1. Tamara: ITOM simply wants to have the right to approve any courses that may affect them.
- E. Chris: Disagreed with the idea that a given college/department should have exclusive rights to a given area of study. For our students, we should always err on the side of allowing colleges/departments to develop programs for the benefit of those students. No one group should have veto power over another. We should consider what the roles of GPC and UGS are & should be.
1. Mihaela: Agreed that there should be cooperation by and between colleges/departments.
  2. Eric Berlatsky: Agreed with no veto power but more cooperation needed in areas where courses may be required in multiple disciplines.
  3. David Newman: Similar courses offered in multiple disciplines may be vastly different and are taught in the context of how it will be applied.
  4. Mihaela: I think we are all on the same page where this is concerned.
  5. Paul Peluso: The faculty ultimately own the curriculum. In situations where a consensus cannot be reached, it is the role of the committees (GPC & UGC) to adjudicate these matters up to, and including, Faculty Senate where the faculty has a voice.
  6. Tamara: If committees don't approve these items, they can cause a great deal of angst and confrontational situations as they move up the ladder through the process.

## V. Discussion Items

### A. Discussion about Dissertations – Paul Peluso

1. Paul shared a Power Point presentation of the various program's responses to the Dissertation questionnaire sent out this past summer.
  - a. All of this detailed information is in the link that Paul shared with the UGC membership.
  - b. Eric: Noted that the 5-year requirement in Arts & Letters is only for Public Administration, not for Comparative Studies.
    - i. All the responses for A&L appear to reflect only Public Administration and do not include Comparative Studies.
    - ii. Paul: I will amend with responses from Comparative Studies which will update in the link provided.

2. Questions pertaining to the presentation
  - a. Eric: 2 points: First, dissertation work is a lot of work for faculty and this should be acknowledged. Second, I don't feel there should be a University-wide policy regarding this topic. There are too many differences across disciplines but some general guidance would be helpful.
  - b. David Newman: Generally in agreement with Eric's points. With regard to outside dissertation committee members, we need clarification on what "outside" means. Outside the department, the college or the University?
  - c. Robert Stackman: The Graduate College Governance Document sets the minimums. This does not preclude the colleges from adding additional, or more stringent, requirements.
  - d. Chris: The Governance Document could require colleges to spell out clear standards for their college, not just setting minimums.
    - i. Regarding compensation, faculty should be, and must be, recognized for their work on these committees. They should be credited on annual assignments but not an overload on annual assignments. The actual percentage this committee work should count towards annual assignments should be left to the chairs. There should be an upper limits on overloads as well. The Provost should make it clear to Chairs that this should be taken into consideration when making annual assignments.
  - e. William Kalies: This should also be considered when discussing promotions and/or tenure.
  - f. Eric: Some consideration should be given to providing overloads for faculty serving on these committees. Particularly if an individual is serving on multiple committees.
3. Paul: I will "clean up" the responses the questions received and share with UGC for further discussion and a vote at the December 16, 2020 meeting.

**VI.** Roundtable Discussion

- A. No additional discussion items.

**VII.** Meeting adjourned by UGC Chair, Paul Peluso at 11:57 a.m.

*The next University Graduate Council meeting is December 16, 2020.*