

**Minutes  
University Graduate Council  
February 18, 2009**

**Present:** William McDaniel (Chair), Business Presiding; Deborah Floyd, Education; Gail Burnaford, Education; Elwood Hamlin II, CAUPA; Ali Zilouchian, Engineering; Ronald Nyhan, CAUPA; Larry Liebovitch, Science; Doug Broadfield, Arts & Letters; Charles Roberts, Science; Shirley Gordon, Nursing; Khaled Sobhan, Engineering; Chad Simon, Graduate Student Association; Massimo Caputi, Biomedical Science

**Excused Absence:** Ruth McCaffrey, Nursing; Ben Lowe, Arts & Letters; John Bernardin, Business; Xupei Huang, Biomedical Science

**Others Present:** Barry Rosson, Graduate College; Susan Fulks, Graduate College

The meeting was called to order by Dr. McDaniel at 1:35 p.m.

**I. The minutes from the January 2009 meeting were approved unanimously by the Graduate Council.**

McDaniel recommended the council discuss the “Seven Year Rule” as the first item of business.

**II. “Seven Year Rule”**

Nyhan moved to change the university rule dealing with recency of credits. He moved to increase the seven-year rule to a ten-year rule for graduate students, with the provision that colleges and/or programs have the right to set more stringent time constraints. This motion was seconded by Floyd and approved unanimously by the council.

**III. Graduate College Governance Document**

McDaniel presented the document as revised by the subcommittee (Zilouchian, Floyd, and Broadfield) for discussion by the council. McDaniel reported that the Provost may want to meet with the council to discuss amendments to the document.

McDaniel informed the council that he met with Eric Shaw and confirmed that the document, once approved by the Graduate Council, must be approved again by UFS Steering Committee and the UFS. McDaniel asked for motions and/or comments from the council about the amended document.

Floyd and Zilouchian made a brief presentation to the council about the process the subcommittee used to amend the document. McDaniel again called on the council for amendments to (or discussion about) the document.

Burnaforde talked about how the process feels better having gone back to the faculty for feedback. Burnaforde also recommended going page by page through the document as revised by the subcommittee.

Floyd gave a brief synopsis of the process the subcommittee underwent to revise the April 4, 2008 document. Floyd stated that the blue text in the revised document (with no track changes beside it) did not represent changes to the original document, but that it was a cut and paste and it came out blue because it was a technical thing. Burnaforde asked Floyd to confirm that the blue did not mean anything. Floyd confirmed. Floyd pointed out that the most significant change was the table called the Summary of Privileges. She mentioned there was also a change in the review process for graduate faculty (under the newly added Reviews and Lists section of the document).

Liebovitch asked the subcommittee if this revised document, in their opinion, would get more positive votes than the April 4, 2008 document. Floyd and Zilouchian said they thought the revisions would have a positive effect in the eyes of faculty members due to the number of concerns that were addressed through the revision process.

Nyhan commented that he had read the subcommittee's revised document, and that no major revisions jumped out at him. He asked the council if they had the same experience in reading the document.

Rosson spoke briefly about the Graduate College's formation in fall 2007 and the need to produce the Governance Document. He also spoke about the meticulous work the council had done over the past year to construct the document. Rosson proposed that the council (especially if there are going to be a great number of changes) go through it with the same care that was taken last year when the document was undergoing construction and revision. Rosson cautioned the council against accepting the document without carefully examining each change that had been made by the subcommittee. He proposed the council examine the revised document in detail to avoid unintended consequences.

Floyd agreed with Rosson's proposed approach. Burnaforde also supported Rosson's idea of carefully reviewing the document, and recommended going through it in detail for the remainder of the meeting. There were no objections to this approach from the council.

**Section I.B.:** The amendment was accepted unanimously by the council (addition of language “respecting appropriate collegial relationships with the University Faculty Senate and college faculty assemblies”).

**Section I.C.:**

The first deletion from I.C. was accepted unanimously by the council due to being redundant.

Burnaforf asked about the second sentence of this section, which spoke about the Graduate College as the clerical center and clearing house, etc. Floyd moved to add back a sentence about the Graduate College providing clerical support for the University Graduate Council. This motion was seconded by Roberts. Rosson pointed out that the Graduate College currently functions as the center for communications between the University Graduate Council, and the faculty, administrators, and external agencies, as stated in the deleted language. Floyd revised her motion to put this sentence back into the document, striking the word “all official”. Roberts seconded this amended motion. The council unanimously agreed to put this sentence back in the document as changed.

**Section II.B.:**

There was no objection to the deletion of “doctoral” from II.B.1.c.

“Approved by the Graduate College Dean” was deleted from II.B.1.c. Rosson recommended adding “approved by the University Graduate Council” to promote uniformity across campus and oversight by the council.

Burnaforf moved that in 1.c., 2.b., and 3.b., “additional written criteria” be followed by “approved by the University Graduate Council”. This change was approved by the council.

The words “masters and specialist” were added back to 2.a., with no objection from the council.

Amendment to 4.c. (changed to “a five-year renewable term”) was approved by the council.

**Section II.C.:**

The council did not approve the substitution of “be appointed” for “apply for status” in 1.a.

The council accepted the addition of “or creative” in sections 1.c. and 2.c.

The council agreed to amend 3.b. to read “Hold at least a master’s degree or professional degree suitable for contributing to the program or show a comparable level of attainment through experience as determined by the Graduate Committee of the program”.

The council approved the addition of the section “Reviews and Lists” as #4 under II.C. Within this section, the council also approved the addition of “and the University Graduate Council” to the end of the second sentence.

Rosson suggested the addition of the word “unit” before graduate faculty, and capitalizing Graduate Faculty in “Reviews and Lists”. The phrase now reads: “based on consultation with unit Graduate Faculty”. This change was approved by the council.

Gordon and Zilouchian mentioned that B2a should be added to the table on page 3. The council approved the following change to the Summary of Privileges table: Under Associate Graduate Faculty and Chair or Co-chair a graduate student’s degree committee, the language will be “See sections B2a and B2b”.

Rosson pointed out that the same change (See sections B2a and B2b) should be made under “Associate Graduate Faculty” and “Serve on a graduate student’s supervisory committee”. The word “Yes” is struck from this box, and the language “see sections B2a and B2b” is substituted. The council approved this change.

#### **Section II.D:**

The council had an extended discussion about 1.a. Liebovitch stated that it is contradictory to have a five-year review period and an automatic reappointment process. Rosson stated that he felt there should be some review process in place for graduate faculty every five years. The council approved an amendment to the last sentence of 1.a. to read “At the end of the five-year period, appointment to the Graduate Faculty will be renewed per section C.4”. The same change was approved for 1.b.

Burnaford took issue with titles of subsections 1. and 2. (“Appointment as Graduate Faculty Not Requiring an Application” and “Appointments Requiring an Application”). The amended titles as approved by the council are “Appointments Not Requiring an Initial Application” and “Appointments Requiring an Initial Application”.

Having reached the end of the scheduled meeting time, McDaniel asked the council how they would like to proceed with the rest of the review of the document. Zilouchian proposed meeting in one week’s time after the GPC meeting (Wednesday, February 25, 2009, 2:30-3:30 p.m.) in SU 113.

**The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.**