

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
June 2, 2000

Attendance: Margaret Appel, Joseph Bernt, Mehmet Celenk, Tiao Chang, William Condee, Douglas Green, Kenneth Hicks, Donald Jordan, Averell Overby, Scott Sparks, Daniel Innis, Patrick Washburn, Gary Schumacher, Leona Cibrowski, Kent Mulliner for Julia Zimmerman, Bobbi Conliff, Larisa Zelenskaya, Adam Weaver

Staff: Gordon Schanzenbach, Jennifer Francone

Excused: Rajindar Koshal, Donald Miles, Maureen Weissenrieder, Jessica Haigney, Josep Rota, Glenn Doston, Jenny Lau

Absent: Richard Miller, Jerrel Mitchell

Guests: Ann Paulins, Martin Tuck, Marti Schwartz

Convened: 2:08 P.M.

Chair's report: Last month's minutes were voted on and passed. Ken Hicks commented that he felt that Graduate Council this year had been very effective. It took a stand with the conflict of interest case and passed several policies that help graduate education at Ohio University. He is proud of what Graduate Council accomplished this year.

Chair Hicks passed out for review the procedures for Conflict of Interest. The language at the top of the document was for reference only and was taken directly from the Faculty Senate handbook. He noted that any changes to that language would need to be made through Faculty Senate. Joseph Bernt passed out an alternate version of the procedures. Joseph Bernt felt that his proposed document deals with the balance between administration and faculty. Under his document, administrators and faculty are encouraged to take courses and even degrees, but degrees should not be in their own college. Bernt also felt that the line is drawn at the power relation between the potential student and the department. Ken Hicks expressed concerns that the language would not be acceptable to the administration. Bernt agreed to have the terms academic chairs and directors removed from the top portion of his document. Ken Hicks stated that he feels Graduate Council is there to make policy and that it should spend less faculty time on procedural issues such as this. Council voted on and passed the amendments. Council voted on and passed the procedures for Conflict of Interest.

Associate Provost for Graduate Studies' Report: The Provost has made a

decision on the investment component and the decision will be released to the press on June 2, 2000. The two proposals recommended were from Condensed Matter and Surface Sciences in the Department of Physics and Astronomy and Clinical Health Research in the Department of Psychology. Both programs had very strong support from the committee. The Associate Provost for Graduate Studies will write the document for the Board of Regents recommending the two programs. At Ohio University, the approach to the Investment Component was to fund fewer programs initially and add more programs later. During the 2000-2001 academic year, funds will be available through the Office of Graduate Studies to help units bring in outside aid in building better proposals. There will be an additional competition during the academic year 2001-2002.

The incentive fund and eminent scholar proposals are out to the committees. The committees will meet on June 8 and will have recommendations to the Provost by June 15, 2000. Letters of intent for both proposals are due at the Board of Regents by July 1, 2000.

Computer Science's final proposal will be going to the Board of Regents within the month. The program should be up for approval by the Board by early fall.

Two years ago a committee reviewed the issue of finals and graduation. The committee recommended moving the beginning of summer session back a week so graduate graduation could be moved to Sunday. The Faculty Senate passed the request to move summer session back a week. Beginning next summer, summer session will begin one week later. The benefits to moving graduate graduation to Sunday is that it will be easier for parents to attend and there would be no conflict with exams. Graduate Council voted on and approved supporting moving graduate graduation to Sunday.

The TA orientation committee passed out an informational report to Graduate Council on its findings regarding TA orientation and training. They were charged with trying to understand what happens at Ohio University for TA training. A survey was sent to all departments and they discovered from the survey that there was quite a variance between departments about TA training and orientation. The committee recommended that an orientation be held for one day before the fall quarter begins. This year it will be held on August 31. During the orientation, there will be breakout sessions that deal with different issues. Throughout the year, additional modules will be held for TA's. This fall orientation is to be held in addition to any training done by the departments. The Center for Teaching Excellence is handling the

orientation training. In following years, the date will be announced well in advance so it can be sent out with offers to incoming students.

Gary Schumacher has charged the Policy and Procedures Committee to better define the terms GA/TA/RA. The Board of Regents and Ohio University would like better definitions for tracking purposes. The committee is to make its recommendations by Mid-fall next year.

At the Funding Commission, there was discussion on changing how to count education and business students in Ph.D. programs. The current procedure overestimates doctoral enrollment. The Regents are also concerned about tuition scholarships without service, but OGS stipends should help to negate the concern at Ohio University. The classification funding model that was being considered in the spring is currently on hold.

Committees:

Curriculum: The School of Human and Consumer Sciences wants to offer a master's degree with a child and family studies major at the Zanesville campus beginning in the fall quarter. They have 25 students who are interested. The program is improved because they will be offering it over a three year period versus the two year period they used in the past. The courses will be taught on-load. Regional Higher Education is helping with faculty. Their target is primarily full-time employees in the human studies field. They are only offering one cohort at a time to keep the quality high. The program was voted on and approved.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology wants to offer a master's degree with a concentration in criminology on the Chillicothe campus beginning in the fall quarter. The courses would be taught on overload. All courses required are the same as what is required at the Athens campus. There are 112 people interested in the program. They are primarily in the law enforcement industry. Each course would be taught one day a week and there would be one course per quarter. The program would take three years to complete and would include summer quarter. The program was voted on and approved.

New Business: There are proposed changes for the Faculty Handbook being brought forth to Faculty Senate regarding University Curriculum Council. The changes regard procedures for program name changes, relocation, and new major codes. The Provost's office has agreed with the changes. The guidelines will be on the web for departments to view so they know the proper procedures.

Adjourned: 3:30 P.M.

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
May 12, 2000

Attendance: Margaret Appel, Joseph Bernt, Mehmet Celenk, Douglas Green, Donald Jordan, Averell Overby, Scott Sparks, Maureen Weissenrieder, Patrick Washburn, Glenn Doston, Jerrel Mitchell, Jessica Haigney, Gary Schumacher, Leona Cibrowski, Bobbi Conliff, Josep Rota.

Staff: Gordon Schanzenbach, Jennifer Francone

Excused: Kenneth Hicks, Rajindar Koshal, Daniel Innis, Jenny Lau

Absent: Tiao Chang, William Condee, Donald Miles, Richard Miller, Julia Zimmerman, Larisa Zelenskaya, Adam Weaver

Guests: Yvette Thomas, Syliva Henry

Convened: 2:08 P.M.

Chair's report: Don Jordan was acting chair in Ken Hicks's absence. April's minutes were voted on and approved.

The conflict of interest guidelines were passed out for review. The document stated that the Office of Graduate Student Services would still get the information on students and give that information to the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies. If there were any potential conflict of interest cases, the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies would make a recommendation to the Admissions committee. If a person is not applying for a degree in the same college that they work, there would normally not be a review. The Admissions committee will review the document and compare it to what other universities in the state are doing. The document will be brought up at the June meeting for action. The Provost has been given a copy of the document. Once passed it will need to go before Faculty Senate.

Associate Provost for Graduate Studies' Report: The enhancement and eminent scholar proposals are due May 15, 2000. Committees for each proposal have been established. Jack Bantle, Richard Hazler, John Kopchick, Gary Schumacher, and Alfred Pheley are on the Incentive Proposal Review Committee, and Jack Bantle, Drew McDaniel, Harold Molineu, Ellengene Peterson, Gary Schumacher, and Leonard Raley are on the Eminent Scholar Proposal Review Committee. They will begin reviewing the proposals soon because letters of intent are due July 1,

2000. The Investment Proposal Review Committee has made its recommendation to the Provost and there should be an announcement shortly.

The Funding Commission has another funding model out that looks better than prior models. It would require all programs to be categorized into two categories. The first category would be for Ph.D. oriented programs or some terminal degree programs. Programs in this category would be allowed to recruit anywhere but enrollment would be capped. The second category would be more professionally oriented programs. In these programs, there would be some effort to reduce subsidy for out of state students and rewards for placement in Ohio. Dr. Schumacher met with the Deans on May 11, 2000 to discuss the new model. Any issues with the model are to be presented to the Board of Regents by May 31, 2000.

The TA orientation committee will have a proposal before Graduate Council at the June meeting. The proposal will call for one day of training in the fall and then ongoing training modules (e.g., grading, web use). There may be a certificate process for students who complete a certain number of modules so they can have something for their resume.

Last year, Physical Therapy made a request for a reservation fee because the department was having problems with students accepting and then backing out. The Fee Committee reviewed the proposal and turned it over to the Deans. The proposal will be reviewed at the next Deans' meeting. If the student did go to Ohio University, the fee would be applied to their tuition. The fee is designed to help with the problem of students not notifying the department in sufficient time to accept other students. Housing and the MBA program already do this. The fee would be non-refundable. There were concerns that the fee may give Ohio University a bad reputation and cause a decline in international students. Nineteen out of twenty benchmark schools in Physical Therapy have this type of fee.

Committees:

Ext. of Time: The committee recommended Abdurrahman Fusayil, Jackie Allenbaugh, and Gayle Yamauchi-Gleason for extension of time. The council voted on and approved the requests.

Conflict of Interest: The committee reviewed the cases of Elizabeth Bennett, Laura Schaeffer, and Pamela Callahan and did not find any conflict of interest. The council voted on and approved the requests.

Policy and Procedures: The committee brought forth a proposal that would require students on a full stipend to be registered for a minimum of 12

graduate credit hours. The reason for 12 graduate credit hours is to balance work load requirements and the desire to have students complete their programs expeditiously. There could be some exceptions that would be handled through the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies' office. Council voted and passed the new policy.

The Policy and Procedures committee is going to look into the definitions of TA/GA/RA and bring them to a future council meeting.

Curriculum: The School of Human and Consumer Sciences' request for a master's degree with a family studies major will go before the dean and then be before Graduate Council at the next meeting.

The School of Music wants to offer a performance certificate beginning fall quarter. The certificate requires less than 31 graduate credit so it does need to go before the Board of Regents. All the courses emphasize performance. The program is for students who do not want a degree but want to improve their performance skills. All the courses already exist in the Master's in Music program. Some students want to study with a particular teacher but do not intend to get a degree. The classes are graduate level only. The program could be for students in other programs at the university. Graduate Council voted on and approved the program.

Old Business: The electronic thesis and dissertation (ETD) report was brought forth for action. There would be a two year test and trial period and then the program would be brought forth to determine whether or not it would become mandatory. There would be a steering committee to monitor the process. The steering committee would be under Graduate Council. The process would be administered out the Office of Graduate Studies. The university would try to encourage students by offering to print a required paper copy free if they do an electronic thesis or dissertation. There are already four or five universities in Ohio who are moving quickly on ETDs. OhioLink is very helpful with the operating programs and electronic storage of the theses and dissertations. The proposal was voted on and passed.

Adjourned: 3:05 P.M.

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
April 14, 2000

Attendance: Margaret Appel, Joseph Bernt, Mehmet Celenk, Tiao Chang, William Condee, Douglas Green, Kenneth Hicks, Donald Jordan, Donald Miles, Averell Overby, Scott Sparks, Maureen Weissenrieder, Patrick Washburn, Glenn Doston, Jerrel Mitchell, Jessica Haigney, Gary

Schumacher, Leona Cibrowski, Kent Mulliner for Julia Zimmerman, Bobbi Conliff, Larisa Zelenskaya, Adam Weaver

Staff: Gordon Schanzenbach, Jennifer Francone

Excused: Rajindar Koshal, Daniel Innis, Josep Rota, Jenny Lau

Absent: Richard Miller

Guests: Gene Mapes, John Keifer, Roger Rollins, Bruce Steiner, Dorothy Bryant, Milton Butler

Convened: 2:07 P.M.

Chair's Report: The minutes for the March meeting were voted on and approved. Ken Hicks stated some observations on the conflict of interest situation. He informed council that the Provost had decided not to follow the Graduate Council's recommendation for Carolyn Bailey Lewis. The Provost admitted Ms. Bailey-Lewis with three contingencies:

1. Dean Krendl is to recuse herself from all responsibilities related to Ms. Bailey-Lewis's degree program. The Provost will be responsible for any duties normally done by the dean (e.g., signing of Ms. Bailey-Lewis's dissertation).
2. Two people outside of the College of Communication shall be appointed to Ms. Bailey-Lewis's graduate committee. The two people can either be in addition to the normal members or in place of the normal members.
3. Ms. Bailey-Lewis will not be allowed to take any courses from the Director of the School of Interpersonal Communication.

Ken Hicks stated that he felt that it is disappointing when the Provost does not accept Council recommendations, but that this does not diminish Council's role. He feels that since the Provost made a decision independent of the Graduate Council's recommendation, she is responsible for the situation and will need to handle any problems if they arise. Ken Hicks stated that he feels that there does not need to be any further action by council since the Graduate Council recommends actions to the Provost.

Ken Hicks would like to have guidelines on conflict of interest passed that the Graduate Council and the Provost can both agree upon. After the policy is in place, there may no longer be a need for a committee to review all cases. Gary Schumacher noted that at the last RACGS meeting he attended he asked other members about how their schools handle such

situations and they stated that they have policies in place that require no regular review. Ohio University is apparently the only university in Ohio that does this type of reviewing process. Dr. Schumacher also noted that he reviewed available council minutes for the last four years and in 151 cases reviewed only two were turned down. Chair Hicks would like to have a policy established that works like the 260 hour rule. He feels that council members' time could be better used.

There was a motion made that the Admissions Requirement Committee put together a policy to be brought forth at the May meeting for review. The Graduate Council voted on the motion and it was passed with one opposed vote. Joseph Bernt thought that there should be greater discussion as to what the policy should entail. Chair Hicks agreed that Graduate Council needs to discuss the issue further and noted that in the agenda under Old Business time was allotted for that discussion. He also noted that the policy would need to go before the Faculty Senate and stated that he would initiate contact.

Ken Hicks wanted to address the issue of increasing work loads on department chairs and graduate chairs. The increased load seems to relate to the amount of reporting on graduate programs. There seems to be a continuous requirement to justify graduate programs. Some people felt that the Board of Regents is one of the major causes of the increase. Some members noted that there is not just an increase in graduate work load but a general increase in work load. It seems that departments are being pulled in several directions. The university does not seem to be very clear in its mission statement. There seems to be a lack of correlation between reporting and the outcome. Dr. Schumacher noted that over the years there has been a lot of change. He noted that is one reason for moving the departmental review process from every five years to every seven. It was observed that review guidelines are difficult to interpret and are sometimes changed. There is sometimes a question of criteria because review guidelines are not very explicit. Chair Hicks asked that everyone think about the problem and bring ideas to the next meeting.

Associate Provost's Report: Gary Schumacher received the guidelines for the Eminent Scholar and Incentive Proposals from the Board of Regents. The letter of intent is due July 1, 2000 and final proposals are due September 1, 2000 for both proposals. The Office of Graduate Studies sent out a request to departments for a two page concept paper. A committee will review the concept papers and choose which departments will be asked to submit full proposals. For each eminent scholar proposal we submit, we will need to have \$750,000 in matching funds. For the first year of the incentive proposal process, Ohio University will be able to submit proposals totaling \$1.8 million. The incentive proposal process is

open to all doctoral programs.

In November, the Graduate Council passed the 260 hours rule. Dr. Schumacher would like the Policies and Regulations Committee to consider modifying the minimum hour enrollment in that policy for students on a stipend. There appears to be a negative impact on some departments having the minimum enrollment at 15 hours for masters and 12 for doctoral students. The old requirement was 9 hours. The new policy will be presented at the next meeting.

At the last Funding Commission meeting, the commission appeared to back off modifying the 51 hour rule for the transition from masters to doctoral level. A few years back, the Regents switched databases so there is not a reliable source of data to make that transition possible. They are considering having masters funding changes occur in education and business programs only because that is where the major problem is. In these two areas, they may try a new level of masters funding to support students who are not in doctoral programs.

The Office of Graduate Studies is now able to monitor fee-paying students. Two sets of reports have been sent to departments for their review. The Investment component proposals are currently being reviewed. The committee will submit a final recommendation to the Provost. Dr. Schumacher will keep Graduate Council informed on the decisions.

Assistant Provost's Report: Gordon Schanzenbach informed the Graduate Council that the graduate contracts were now on the web for departments to download and use. The Office of Graduate Studies has revised the summer registration process to make it easier for students.

Committee Reports:

Fellowship Committee: The Fellowship Committee received eleven applications. They chose five nominees with two alternates in the event that one of the nominees turned down their fellowship. The Graduate Council voted and approved Dale Casamatta from Environmental and Plant Biology for the Donald Clippinger Fellowship, Gabriela Petculescu from Physics for the John Cady Fellowship, Lance McBrayer from Biological Sciences for the Claude Kantner Fellowship, Yueh-hsia Chang from Teacher Education for the Anthony Trisolini Fellowship, and David Beckman from Civil Engineering for the Graduate Fellowship. Alternate John Gunstad is from Clinical Psychology and Alicia Massie-Legg is from Music.

Curriculum Committee: The committee brought forth three programs for review. The first was from the School of Music to offer a Master's of Music beginning fall quarter. The program would primarily be done with distance learning and video. The curriculum for the program is already in place. The program is geared toward middle and secondary school teachers. The students would not need to take any time off from work for the program. There have already been 147 inquiries into the program. The classes would be taught by Athens faculty on-load. The council approved the program.

The second program was from the College of Business to offer an MBA for Brazilian executives. The courses will primarily be taught during summer and intersession in combination with distance learning throughout the academic year. The college would follow all overload guidelines. The program would begin summer of 2001. The students would come to the Athens campus in the summer of 2001 for the first of four on-campus programs occurring in summer and intersession breaks. The first summer they would spend three weeks taking OPIE courses and one week being introduced to their next three courses. The students would be required to have 550 on the TOEFL. The program is being offered in conjunction with the Vargas Foundation. The council approved the program.

The third program was from the College of Arts and Sciences to offer a Social Science Master's program on the Zanesville campus. The classes would be in the history, political sciences, and geography departments. The program is about 25 years old and has been approved in the past for regional campus delivery. All administrative work would be handled through the history department. It would be taught by Athens faculty and some regional faculty. It is designed to start in the fall 2000 and end in the spring 2002. The primary students would be middle and high school teachers. The council approved the program.

Old Business: There was a policy written by the Admissions Requirement committee about conflict of interest but it was never voted on. It was suggested that any contract employee could not get a degree in the college in which they work. Chair Hicks suggested that it should only be restricted to departments because the university wants to encourage people to continue learning. The current policy in the Faculty Handbook restricts people by positions so a new policy might consider some modification of this approach. There may need to be a different provision for courses than degrees. The policy should be agreeable to the Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, and the Provost. Any feedback about the policy should be sent to Ken Hicks.

New Business: The draft report from the Electronic Thesis and

Dissertation committee was presented to council. The committee decided that the university should provide a process for students to submit their thesis or dissertation electronically. OhioLink is putting together a process for electronic theses and dissertations to be available through OhioLink. The committee recommends that Ohio University use OhioLink as a server. The committee believes that the university should use a phase-in process for implementing the electronic thesis and dissertation process. The committee suggested that there be a subcommittee of Graduate Council to monitor the process and help establish guidelines for ETD. The library would still keep a paper copy but would like to use the incentive that if students submit their thesis or dissertation electronically the library would copy and bind it for them. The Office of Graduate Studies may need to have an office to advise and/or help students with their formatting of ETD. Due to the effects that having the thesis or dissertation on the web for publishing, the committee recommends allowing students to be able to restrict access. The final report will be before the Graduate Council in May for vote.

It was noted that finals are held on the same day as graduate graduation. This is unfair to students who have to either take exams or administer them. There is also a problem that faculty also have to leave the ceremony to administer exams.

Adjourned: 3:53 P.M.

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
March 10, 2000

Attendance: Margaret Appel, Joseph Bernt, Mehmet Celenk, Tiao Chang, William Condee, Kenneth Hicks, Rajindar Koshal, Donald Miles, Averell Overby, Scott Sparks, Maureen Weissenrieder, Patrick Washburn, Glenn Doston, Jerrel Mitchell, Jessica Haigney, Gary Schumacher, Julia Zimmerman, Bobbi Conliff, Josep Rota, Larisa Zelenskaya.

Staff: Gordon Schanzenbach, Jennifer Francone

Excused: Daniel Innis, Leona Cibrowski.

Absent: Douglas Green, Donald Jordan, Richard Miller, Adam Weaver, Jenny Lau.

Guests: Dina Lopez, Gene Mapes, Sharon Brehm, Aimee Howley.

Convened: 2:07 P.M.

Chair's Report: Ken Hicks distributed copies of the Graduate Council's home page and asked for any suggestions. He stated that there will be links from the committee page to committee procedures. He also passed out the procedures for each committee with slight changes from the last Graduate Council meeting. The chair stated that during old business they could discuss any changes that needed to be made to the procedures. Josep Rota suggested a link to the University International Council web site be added. Chair Hicks stated that previous approved minutes were also on the web site. February's minutes were voted on and approved.

Chair Hicks stated that Provost Brehm was present to discuss the appeal of Carolyn Lewis. Chair Hicks reviewed his letter to Ms. Lewis regarding her appeal to council regarding the conflict of interest decision. The letter stated that the council voted 13 to 3 after considerable discussion on the appeal that there was a potential conflict of interest. The bases for this decision were:

1. Dean Krendl signs off on all of the theses and is Ms. Lewis's direct supervisor. Chair Hicks stated that he felt that there was not a likelihood that a conflict would occur but the situation is listed in the procedures as a potential conflict of interest.

2. The interns at the Telecommunications Center report to Ms. Lewis and an intern's advisor could possibly be a professor for Ms. Lewis.

The Provost stated that she has never encountered this type of situation before. She reviewed all the materials and came to a very different conclusion than did Graduate Council. She came to the meeting so that she could better understand Graduate Council's opinion. She feels that the thesis is a small point. Someone else other than the dean could sign off on the thesis (e.g. the Provost). Also, the interns at the Telecommunications Center are not there for credit. They are there for experience. A committee of five people select the interns and Carolyn Lewis is not one of them. Ms. Lewis has no direct contact with any of the interns and there would not be any interpersonal communication graduate students underneath her. The Provost was most interested in the conflict of interest procedure. She had never seen it before. It is not located in either the Faculty Handbook or in the Policies and Procedures. The Provost feels that the people listed in the senior administrative category need to be notified that they are not allowed to apply for or take classes in graduate school. She feels that a conflict of interest decision denies employee benefits and this should be done carefully. There is no policy currently that implied power causes conflict of interest and if one were passed, could not be retroactively applied to Ms. Lewis's situation. The Provost was concerned about where the line should be drawn. If it is too strict, then no one could ever take classes who works at the university. Ms. Lewis would not be allowed to serve on any university committees while she was in the graduate program. The Provost realizes the importance of protecting the quality of our graduate programs but is concerned that if the process is too restrictive then it may cause difficulties. The Provost compared the situation to spouses working within the same department. The university makes sure that appropriate measures are taken so that they cannot influence one another. The Provost would use a recusal process to try to eliminate any conflict of interest. She believes that there is no way that any Ohio University employee would not have conflict of interest beyond a shadow of a doubt. When the Provost moved the Telecommunications Center under the college, she made sure that the two were very separate, especially financially. The Provost wanted to reiterate that she believes that Ms. Lewis is being held to too high of a standard.

At this time the Graduate Council was invited to respond to the Provost's position. Council members stated that they were trying to retain consistency with their past decisions. The Provost responded that she believed each case should be judged on its own merit. Council members also responded that it did not want to prevent Ms. Lewis from taking classes or getting a degree but that she should not be allowed to do so in that college. Council members felt that she could apply for an interdisciplinary degree. The Provost stated that she presented this option

to Ms. Lewis but she was unwilling to compromise which degree she received. Council members were also concerned about the potential for conflict of interest. They felt that there was a potential conflict of interest, not that there was one for sure. The Provost responded that there are potential conflicts of interest constantly but the university builds in recusal processes because the benefits are greater to the university than the possibility of conflict of interest. The Provost believes that if a newly hired person has an inherent conflict of interest that they should be told at the time of hiring that they will not be allowed to take graduate courses. A council member stated that he believed the university should operate under good will. The Provost urged Graduate Council to bring their procedure forth to the Faculty Senate to become a policy. She suggested that if the council thought directors were inherently in a conflict of interest situation, the council should consider adding a statement saying that directors would not be allowed to get degrees in the college that they work in. The Provost ended by stating that she just did not agree with the Graduate Council's position.

Associate Provost for Graduate Studies' Report: Gary Schumacher passed out the list of committee members reviewing the investment proposals. The committee has already met once to discuss procedures. They will have a review sheet to check if the departments have met the criteria. The final ratings will be on a five point scale. The members will rate independently and will not vote on their own department's proposal. The committee's recommendations are due to the Provost between May 1 and May 15, 2000. The committee will present a written recommendation. The final investment plan needs to be to the Regents by July 1, 2000. Dr. Schumacher noted that the deadlines for letters of intent for eminent scholars and incentive component proposals were changed to July 1, 2000 and the deadlines for final proposals were changed to September 1, 2000. The criteria for eminent scholars are still being finalized but there are some basic requirements. They must come from a strong program, they must help meet state needs (e.g. economic development, K-12 education, public health), and the university must have a \$750,000 endowment match. Once official guidelines have been distributed, a call for proposals will be sent out. Dr. Schumacher realizes the strain this places on chairs and will initially only request a two page concept paper. Only seven eminent scholars will be chosen for the entire state. The university is allowed to submit as many proposals as it wishes for eminent scholars, but it must be able to have the endowment match for each one. The guidelines have been established for the incentive component. The proposals must show how the program will meet state needs. The university may ask for three times the contributed amount, which is about \$240,000, totaling approximately \$720,000. Once again there will be a general call to doctoral programs for a two page concept paper. The Office

of Graduate Studies will send feedback to the departments on how to improve their proposals since this will become a yearly process for all three components.

Dr. Schumacher went to a Funding Commission meeting on February 29, 2000. They are still considering masters funding issues. The shift from 90 hours to 51 hours may be changed to 75 instead. The changes from 51 hours to 90 hours could cause about a 28% drop in Ph.D. enrollment. Some initial analyses indicate that Ohio University will suffer from the shift. The Funding Commission is considering adding some other variables besides enrollment to the masters funding formula. These variables may include the number of research dollars generated by masters programs or whether students are employed in Ohio after they graduate. These all show potential problems.

The Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Committee is moving forward. They have completed their open forum presentations. They will be drafting a report with their recommendations and present it at the May meeting. The TA Training and Orientation committee has had two meetings. They are interviewing graduate chairs to see what sort of training process they currently have in place. Their goal is to have a coherent training model. They will bring their proposal to council in late spring. The Policies and Regulations Committee will be asked to review the TA/RA/GA designations to have better definitions. This will help to better understand departmental teaching resources.

Assistant Provost for Graduate Studies' Report: No report.

Committees:

Curriculum: Educational Studies wishes to offer a masters degree with emphasis in educational administration at five regional campuses. The committee recommended the proposal to council. They currently have twenty students in each of the five programs. There is currently a shortage of school administrators in Ohio and this program will help to supply more administrators for Ohio. It is a two year program. This program is identical to the one on the Athens campus. It is a completely off-campus program and is very internship focused. It requires 69 credits with 34 being completed during the summer. The Graduate Council voted on and approved the program.

Conflict of Interest: The committee found no evidence of potential conflict of interest for Mary Hogan or Shelly Morris. The Graduate Council voted and approved the two for admission.

Old Business:

Julia Zimmerman informed the council that the Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Committee brought in a group of visitors to discuss the issue. OhioLink will provide all of the technology and storage for electronic theses and dissertations. Virginia Tech has created the National Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD) to be a repository for theses and dissertations. Ms. Zimmerman believes that implementing an electronic thesis and dissertation program is a very doable project but should be done slowly. A policy will need to be made about the suppression of theses or dissertations. Students may be allowed to suppress their thesis or dissertation for a short period of time but not indefinitely. Some advantages of electronic theses and dissertations is that multimedia can be incorporated and hyperlinks can be created to other web sites or to other points within the document.

New Business:

Some council members showed concern about the procedures of the conflict of interest committee. They were not sure whether or not the committee was necessary or how it will function if the provost decides to overturn decisions recommended by the committee and approved by an overwhelming majority of council members. They thought that a policy needs to be written that can be upheld. They thought that the wording of the current procedure should be dealt with.

Adjourned: 3:55 P.M.

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
February 11, 2000

Attendance: Margaret Appel, Joseph Bernt, Tiao Chang, Mehmet Celenk, William Condee, Greg Nadon for Douglas Green, Kenneth Hicks, Donald Miles, Richard Miller, Averell Overby, Scott Sparks, Maureen Weissenrieder, Daniel Innis, Patrick Washburn, Glenn Doston, Jerrel Mitchell, Jessica Haigney, Gary Schumacher, Leona Cibrowski, Julia Zimmerman, Bobbi Conliffiee, Adam Weaver, Josep Rota

Staff: Gordon Schanzenbach, Jennifer Francone

Excused: Donald Jordan, Jenny Lau

Absent: Rajindar Koshal

Guests: Gene Mapes, Charles Parks

Convened: 2:08 P.M.

Chair's Report: The minutes from the last meeting were voted on and approved.

Ken Hicks met with the Provost to discuss the Carolyn Lewis appeal. The Provost had prior conversations with Dean Krendl. Chair Hicks explained the Graduate Council's position. The Provost stated that she did see a potential for conflict of interest but had doubts about the Graduate Council's decision. The Provost will meet with Carolyn Lewis to discuss the internship situation and the relationship with Dean Krendl. The Provost will consider the appeal and may come to the next council meeting to discuss her decision. If the Provost decides to overturn the Graduate Council decision on the conflict on interest case of Carolyn Lewis, then the faculty handbook states that there are options for possible recourse, if desired by Graduate Council.

The Chair passed out a preliminary draft of a new version of the Conflict of Interest guidelines. The guidelines were based on information found in the Graduate Chair's, Faculty, and Graduate Council handbooks. Council members should review the guidelines and e-mail any suggested changes to Ken Hicks. At the next council meeting a final draft will be voted on for approval.

The Chair also handed out preliminary drafts of the committee procedures and guidelines for the Policies and Procedures Committee and the Curriculum Committee. The Chair received two different versions of the Policies and Procedures guidelines. He will send the correct version by e-mail to council members. It was suggested that the Curriculum Committee guidelines outline the appropriate steps that need to be taken for new programs.

Associate Provost for Graduate Studies Report: Gary Schumacher announced that a new president, Larisa Zelenskaya, has been elected to the Graduate Student Senate. The Office of Graduate Studies has signed with CollegeNet for graduate applications on-line. Summer and Fall reimbursements for tuition scholarships have been sent to the departments. OGS stipend numbers for 2000-2001 are out to the colleges. Gary Schumacher is currently working on a document to explain OGS stipends that will be included in the offers to new graduate students. The Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Committee is going to have at least two more on-site visitors to discuss the new process. The recommendation regarding Electronic Theses and Dissertations will be before Graduate Council in the spring.

Gary Schumacher reported on the Funding Commission meeting of January 28, 2000. The Regents staff reported at that meeting that masters level graduate funding has been very stable for the last 10 years. The Commission is considering changing the credit hour level for movement from masters to doctoral funding from 51 to 90 quarter hours. This will allow schools to count hours that are now lost but may have other consequences that are being look at. The Commission is beginning to look at the impact of graduate education on the state of Ohio and hopes to better inform the legislature on the importance of graduate education. Gary Schumacher is chairing a RACGS committee to develop a report and strategy on the importance of graduate education for the state. Any council members who know of information relevant to this topic should e-mail him.

At the RACGS meeting on February 4, 2000, there was a discussion regarding Ph.D. funding. RACGS members were informed that the application deadlines for the 5% incentive component and Eminent Scholars proposals are being established. The initial deadlines announced were May 1, 2000 for letters of intent and July 1, 2000 for full proposals. RACGS asked that these be delayed until July 1, 2000 and September 1, 2000 respectively to allow universities more time. The Regents' staff agreed to seek the delayed deadlines. RACGS is meeting again on March 3, 2000 to discuss guidelines for these proposals. The final guidelines are to be available by April 1, 2000.

Assistant Provost for Graduate Studies Report: No Report.

Committee Reports:

Extension of Time: The committee chair stated that after this academic year the committee will no longer have any responsibilities. Any student accepted after 1993 will need to apply for re-admission through the graduate committee of the program and the dean of the college. The college will then be responsible for flagging students who are close to their time limit. Michael Tobar was granted a time extension by council.

Curriculum: Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering is requesting permission to offer a masters program at the Zanesville campus. They currently have 20 applicants for the program. The courses will be taught by Athens faculty members on overload. The council voted on and passed the program. It will now need to go through RACGS.

Conflict of Interest: The committee considered requests from Shelly England, Stephen Knotts, Michelle Lewis, Ann Slater, Robin White, and

Ruth White and found no evidence for conflict of interest. The Council voted in support of the committee recommendations.

New Business: The Curriculum Committee voiced a concern that proposals frequently were presented so close to the date that the program was to begin. The committee would like to have deadlines for proposals to be submitted to the committee. Gordon Schanzenbach pointed out the 49% of the courses in a degree program can be taught before needing approval.

Adjourned: 3:15 P.M.

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes January 14, 2000

Attendance: Joseph Bernt, Mehmet Celenk, Tiao Chang, William Condee, Kenneth Hicks, Donald Jordan, Rajindar Koshal, Donald Miles, Averell Overby, Patrick Washburn, Jerrel Mitchell, Jessica Haigney, Gary Schumacher, Leona Cibrowski, Julia Zimmerman, Bobbi Conliffiee.

Staff: Gordan Schanzenbach, Jennifer Francone.

Excused: Douglas Green, Scott Sparks, Daniel Innis, Josep Rota, Jenny Lau.

Absent: Margaret Appel, Richard Miller, Maureen Weissenrieder, Glenn Doston.

Meeting Convened: 2:08 P.M.

Chair's Report: The minutes for the last council meeting were voted on and approved.

The Chair updated the council on Carolyn Lewis's appeal. A review of the Faculty Handbook indicated that the next step in the appeal is to the Provost. That appeal will go forward. Graduate Council Chair Ken Hicks and the Provost will meet prior to the Provost's decision to summarize the position taken by Graduate Council. If the Provost overrules the Graduate Council's decision, the council will need to discuss how to respond to the Provost's decision.

The Chair informed the council that their web site should be updated by the end of the academic year since it is outdated. He asked the council for suggestions on the content of the council's web site. There was a

suggestion to have guidelines for extension of time. Ken Hicks suggested that procedures for the committees be posted. He would also like for the committees to give him an outline of their duties. There was also a suggestion for doctoral review guidelines to be posted. The minutes and meeting schedule should be posted. There was concern about the content of the minutes and whether they may need to be edited. There was also a request to have a link for the Graduate Council web site to the University Curriculum Council's web site. The Chair will work with the Associate Provost's to update the web site.

The committee is being formed that will review the selective enhancement proposals. The committee will review the proposals and make recommendations to the Provost. The committee is being formed by Ken Hicks, Chair of Graduate Council, Gary Schumacher, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, and Gary Pfeifer, Chair of Faculty Senate. Any recommendations on committee members should be e-mailed to Ken Hicks. Gary Schumacher will attend the selective enhancement committee meetings but will submit a separate recommendation to the Provost.

Associate Provost for Graduate Studies' Report: The computer science program proposal has received most of the reviews on its preliminary proposal and things look positive. They hope to have a full proposal to the Board of Regents soon. The Master's in Accountancy program is moving along quickly. There are already responses coming in from the Board of Regents and they are very positive. Due to the council's quick action, classes should be able to begin in spring. The Funding Commission is meeting on January 28, 2000. The topic for the meeting is the importance of graduate education on Ohio's economy. Please let Gary Schumacher know if you know of any evidence showing the importance. The stipend proposals have been reviewed and granted. Nine proposals were granted for a total of \$105,000. There were a total of thirty-four requests submitted. Gary Schumacher is hoping to obtain more monies from the reallocation fund to continue additional stipend grants. The web based application process is getting underway. Students will be able to apply online. The new process will not immediately effect departments and will begin for next year's applicants. Gary Schumacher met with representatives from each of the colleges to discuss Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) stipends for next year. Memos with final numbers will be out by the end of January. This year's graduate ceremony has changed. The College of Osteopathic Medicine will have a separate ceremony. The graduate ceremony will allow mentors to do the hooding of their own students. Karin Sandell and Gary Schumacher are forming a committee to review TA orientation and training. The Office of Graduate Studies is trying to prepare a newsletter. It would go to alumni and current graduate students. Gary Schumacher is hoping to have the first one out by the end of this academic year. He is

hoping for a higher profile for graduate education.

Assistant Provost for Graduate Studies' Report: The Graduate Appointments office is working on a system for graduate contracts to be on the web for departments to download and fill out. This will help reduce errors in contracts. Summer scholarships and mini-stipends will continue for this year as they were last year. Personnel in the Graduate Appointments Office and a small sub-committee are developing a new system to identify students who will be applying for the special summer tuition scholarships and mini-stipends.

Committee Reports:

Extension of Time: David DeOreo requested an extension of time to make the changes on his master's thesis. The council voted to grant Mr. DeOreo a time extension to Fall 2000.

Conflict of Interest. There were eight potential conflict of interest cases. The committee did not find that any had a conflict of interest. The council voted that none had a conflict of interest. The following have been approved for graduate work: Angie Lynn Cantrell, Sanjeev Gunawardena, Jamie Huff, Heather Keller, Virginia Obeius, Oscar Parades, Brian Phillips, and Marsha Willan.

New Business: The Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Committee is having an open forum on January 27, 2000. Ross Shanley-Roberts from Miami University will speak on their implementation of electronic storage of theses and dissertations. The Forum will be held in the Friends of the Library room from 2:00 P.M.- 3:00 P.M.

Adjournment: 2:46 P.M.

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
December 9, 1999

Attendance: Joseph Bernt, Tiao Chang, Douglas Green, Kenneth Hicks, Donald Miles, Averell Overby, Scott Sparks, Maureen Weissenrieder, Daniel Innis, Patrick Washburn, Glenn Doston, Jessica Haigney, Gary Schumacher, Leona Cibrowski, Kent Mulliner for Julia Zimmerman, Bobbi Conliffee, Jenny Lau.

Staff: Jennifer Francone

Excused: William Condee, Donald Jordan, Rajindar Koshal, Josep Rota, Gordon Schanzenbach, Margaret Appel, Jerrel Mitchell, Mehmet Celenk,.

Absent: Richard Miller, James Crawford.

Guests: Florence Sharp, Kathy Krendl, David Descutner.

Meeting Convened: 10:05 A.M.

Chair's Report: Chair Ken Hicks introduced the appeal for Carolyn Lewis' appeal. He stated that the council would take time to review the letters involved in the case, ask questions of Dean Krendl and David Descutner, have a private council discussion on the appeal, and then vote. Chair Hicks stated that he brought the appeal forward because he did not feel that there had been adequate time at the previous council meeting to properly discuss this issue.

Ken Hicks addressed some of the issues presented in the previous council as to whether or not there was a conflict. He reviewed points on both sides of the issue. He noted that there is a distinct separation between the Center and the School itself and neither the Director or the Dean sees a conflict. He also noted that the council needs to determine if there is a real conflict that exists and cautioned that parallels to prior decisions need to be carefully drawn. The Chair also pointed out that some believe conflicts may exist because the Director of the Center is in a position to influence others. He noted that the Dean also must sign Carolyn Lewis' thesis. Several administrative controls, also called firewalls, were suggested by Dean Krendl at the November meeting of Graduate Council, but these still cause concern for several members of council.

Dean Krendl responded that a clear determination of conflict had not been determined and that the possible conflicts that were presented would affect Carolyn Lewis if she tried to get a degree in any department. Dean Krendl also stated that the firewalls that were set up were done by the Provost because an administrative office was reporting to an academic office. She also said that there were always going to be potentials for conflicts of interest, but precautions had been taken.

Dean Krendl stated that there are separate budget processes for the Center and the School and there is no way to transfer money between the two. She noted that the directors and the dean meet weekly to discuss issues involving the school. Carolyn Lewis would only attend these meetings when an issue involving the Center is discussed. There are interns at the Center but there is an internship coordinator who handles that aspect and the faculty are the ones who give the grades.

The council was concerned that there would not be a way to build a firewall regarding the internships. During discussion, it was noted that

Carolyn Lewis would not be allowed to teach courses or take courses from either Dean Krendl or other directors in the school. However, it was noted that Carolyn Lewis does report directly to Dean Krendl and Dean Krendl does her yearly evaluations.

David Descutner, Director of the School of Interpersonal Communication, commented that Carolyn Lewis would not be allowed to take any courses from him or any other faculty who she would report to. David Descutner and Carolyn Lewis are not colleagues and she has minimum access to faculty.

Dean Krendl and David Descutner left the meeting and the council had a private discussion concerning the conflict of interest. Their concerns were that Carolyn Lewis would not have the same degree as other students because she would not be able to take classes from all the faculty members that are available. Some council members felt that Dean Krendl had addressed many concerns with the proposed firewalls. However, there was concern regarding the chain of command. Carolyn Lewis reports to Dean Krendl, who signs her evaluations and contracts. People observed that other people at Ohio University in similar situations have gone to other universities to avoid such difficulties. There was also the concern that the internship situation could not have a firewall put in place. Professors who advise students holding interns at the center could also be teaching Ms. Lewis and this is seen as a direct conflict of interest because the grades given to Ms. Lewis may be influenced by this situation. In the worst possible case, she could influence the status of internships as a result of grades given. The Associate Provost for Graduate Studies was concerned about which way the pressure worked. He was concerned if Ms. Lewis reported elsewhere if a conflict would still exist.

The council took a voice vote to affirm that there had been sufficient discussion and to do the voting on Ms. Lewis' appeal by secret ballot. A written vote was taken and a majority of the council voted that Carolyn Lewis would be in a conflict of interest situation. The Chair will draft the letter to Carolyn Lewis informing her of the council's decision and the reasons of the denial.

The minutes for the November 12, 1999 Graduate Council Meeting were voted on and accepted.

Associate Provost's Report: Gary Schumacher, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, informed the council that following the vote on the selective enhancement proposal, he sent out a call to all departments to have their proposals in by March 15, 2000. At the Funding Commission and Regents Advisory Council for Graduate Studies (RACGS) meeting he

spoke with deans from the other universities and found that generally they are using the same procedures as Ohio University and have similar concerns about funding. During discussion, he argued that selective enhancement should be used as a way to strengthen programs. He noted that the university's enhancement plan that is sent to RACGS will need to be selective in order to be approved. He reported briefly on the Funding Commission and noted that the Regents were exploring ways to fund graduate education that are not solely enrollment driven.

Committee Reports:

Curriculum: The curriculum committee met on the M.S. in Accountancy for the Lancaster campus and recommended the proposal to the council. Ohio State University is also starting a master's program in accounting, but it should not be a concern because in the year 2000 all CPAs will be required to have five years of education. Also, the Ohio State University program is a day time only program and requires full time enrollment. The Ohio University Lancaster program will have the same requirements as the Athens program. It will be targeted at students and professionals. It is an on-load program using the current faculty. No courses will be offered in the Winter session because that will be a busy season for the potential students. It will be primarily competitive with other MBA programs. The program will generally take two years to complete. The council voted on the new degree and approved it.

Extension of Time: James Sand and Patricia Wickline were recommended for extension of time. The council voted and approved time extensions.

Admission Requirements: No report.

Adjournment: 11:55 A.M.

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
November 12, 1999

Attendance: Margaret Appel, Joseph Bernt, Mehmet Celenk, Tiao Chang, William Condee, Douglas Green, Kenneth Hicks, Donald Jordan, Rajindar Koshal, Jenny Lau, Donald Miles, Averell Overby, Scott Sparks, Maureen Weissenrieder, Daniel Innis, Jessica Haigney, Gary Schumacher, Leona Cibrowski, Julia Zimmerman, Bobbi Conliff, Patrick Washburn.

Staff: Gordon Schazenbach, Jennifer Francone

Excused: Glenn Doston, Josep Rota, Jerrel Mitchell

Absent: Richard Miller, James Crawford.

Guests: Sylvia Henry, Kathy Krendl.

Meeting Convened at 2:10 P.M.

Chair's Report: Chair Ken Hicks welcomed the council. The previous meeting minutes were approved with the addition of Josep Rota being in attendance.

There was a second reading on the Policies on Graduate Student Support. There was no discussion on the second reading. The council voted and passed the new policy.

There was a second reading on the Policy on the 260 Hour Rule. There was concern that the policy would put restrictions on extensions allowed to students. It was stated that the policy is geared to aid students who are having difficulties completing their degrees in a timely fashion. The policy will tentatively go into effective Winter 2000. It is already printed in the Graduate Catalog. The council voted and passed the new policy.

The chair mentioned that Ohio State University is already using the Selective Enhancement process to bring its Ph.D. programs. OSU is targeting several program, such as Psychology, History, Physics, and some other Ph.D. programs for selective enhancement, which means that these programs are being given new faculty positions and extra resources. If Ohio University is to stay competitive in Ph.D. education, we should consider how a program for selective enhancement could help our doctoral programs. The question is: how to obtain the necessary financial resources to do this at Ohio University?

Chair Hicks passed the discussion onto the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies Gary Schumacher.

Associate Provost's Report: Gary Schumacher, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, wanted to advise the council about several topics:

1. The Electronic Theses and Dissertation Committee is active and will make recommendations to the Council by April 1, 2000
2. Approximately \$100,000 for recruitment has been awarded to various schools and departments. There were 30 awards ranging from \$400 to \$5000. The departments are to submit results of their recruiting activities by July 1, 2000.
3. The second Funding Commission of the Regents met for the first time on November 15, 1999 and will discuss master's funding, boundaries for

Ph.D./M.A. funding, and implementation of doctoral funding.

4. A committee is being put together to evaluate TA training for next year. The committee is to have recommendations to the Council by March 15, 2000 for next year and by May 15, 2000 for long term.

5. Proposals for permanent stipend increases are due November 22, 1999.

6. The web sites for the doctoral goal statements are now online.

7. There is a committee looking at how distance education and off-campus programs are financially administered.

Dr. Schumacher introduced the issue of selective enhancement for doctoral programs. He stated that two years ago a Funding Commission was started to review concerns that doctoral programs were being driven by enrollment instead of quality. The commission recommended a Performance Funding Model that included an 85% base component, a 10% investment component, and a 5% incentive component. The Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Studies (RACGS) was given the responsibility to implement the investment component. The investment component calls for each university to submit an enhancement plan by July 1, 2000 in order to receive the 10% investment component subsidy. At Ohio University, a Policy Review Committee was involved in establishing a procedure for Ohio University. This procedure is detailed in the recommended policy and calls for proposals from the departments. The proposals for Selective Enhancement would be due March 15, 2000, selection would be done by May 15, 2000, drafts of the university's investment plan would be done by June 15, 2000, and the final draft would be sent to the Board of Regents by July 1, 2000. Criteria for the proposals would be a clearly articulated mission, evidence of recognized quality, and a well conceptualized plan. Some priority will be given to programs with the ability to leverage these funds for additional monies, who can compete for incentive funds, or who explore reallocation. Funding can be base or term funding. The proposals will be reviewed by a committee put together by the Chair of Faculty Senate, Chair of Graduate Council, and the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies. The reasons for this approach are: (1) the desire for an approach in which units could propose plans and (2) the possibility that although not all units could be funded immediately, the ideas could be used for additional funding requests or capital campaigns. Some concerns are that this process requires too much effort from the departments, that such enhancements have already been done, and that we do not have the funds to do this enhancement without stripping other departments. The goal of the Ohio University procedure is to target Ph.D. programs that are good and make them better so Ohio University can compete better nationally.

Discussion on the report followed:

Several members of Graduate Council were concerned about the effects on the budget at Ohio University to carry out this program. Maureen Weissenrieder, Chair of the Policies and Regulations Committee, summarized discussion of this policy at their committee meeting. The colleges are already allocating resources with the intent to enhance selective programs. One possible way to address the strategic plan for the Ohio Board of Regents is to list the many ways that Ohio University is currently providing enhanced resources to selected programs. Another concern is how much money will be reallocated to selected doctoral programs, and how this will impact the budget of undergraduate and masters level programs. If the amount of money is small and most of it comes from new sources, such as alumni donations and other development funds, then this will not impact other educational levels. However, if the funding for selective enhancement of doctoral education affects the budgets for undergraduate and masters education, then this would likely be a cause for concern by the Deans. Gary Schumacher responded that the intent is not to cut existing programs. However, the intent is to get more dollars into graduate education and various sources are being considered for this purpose.

Ken Hicks discussed his meeting earlier in the day with Provost Brehm. The Provost stated that there are essentially 3 sources for funding the program for selected enhancement of doctoral education: 1) "new" money (donations, increased enrollment, etc.), 2) existing reallocation (the current "one percent tax", which is being phased in slowly over several years), and 3) a "special" reallocation (which might, for example, cut some programs in order to enhance other programs). The third option is not likely to happen, although this is not ruled out at this stage. In any case, there would need to be very good arguments brought forward if the third option were used. So the bottom line is that new money or existing reallocation will likely be the source for the funding the selective enhancement proposals.

Hicks also noted that the Provost said that the second year of the budget is being built now (to be done by April, 2000). The plan for strategic plan for the Board of Regents is due in July, 2000 and will not take effect until the 2001-2002 budget year. So the budget of the next academic year (2000-2001) will not be affected.

Margaret Appel asked if there would be any reallocation between the administrative and academic budgets that might be a source for funding of selective enhancement. It was stated that this is unlikely to happen because of the "firewall" set up to separate these reallocations.

Assistant Provost's Report: Gordon Schazzenbach, Assistant Provost for Graduate Studies, had nothing to report.

Committee Reports:

Extension of Time: The committee voted to grant Connie Anderson, Craig McCarthy, and Karen O'Donnell time extension. The committee did not vote on time extensions for James Sand and Patricia Wickline due to insufficient information.

Admissions Requirements: The Admissions Requirements committee reviewed 15 cases and determined that 14 cases did not have conflicts. Carolyn Lewis, Director of Telecommunications Center, was determined to be in conflict. Kathy Krendl, Dean of Telecommunications spoke to the committee regarding the conflicts addressed. The committee voted on the conflicts and voted to turn down Carolyn Lewis admittance into the Ph.D. program in Interpersonal Communications. Curriculum: The committee recommended approval of a proposal from the School of Music for a Performer's Graduate Diploma. The students would be required to have B.A. level of knowledge in music history and theory. There would be no music theory or history courses required. The council voted and approved the new diploma. Since the program exceeds the maximum credits allowed for a certificate, the program must go before the Board of Regents for approval. Policy and Regulations: The council decided that they wanted to go forward with the Selective Enhancement vote via e-mail. The votes are to be sent to the chair by November 18, 1999.

A meeting has been scheduled for December 9, 1999 at 10:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. in Baker Center 304 to discuss curriculum, extension of time, and selective enhancement.

Adjournment at 3:58 P.M.