

Graduate Council Minutes

December 11, 2015

Attendance: Emilia Alonso-Sameno, Tim Anderson, Steve Bergmeier, Sonsoles De Lacalle, Geoff Dabelko, Jennifer Horner, Vladimir Marchenkov, Brian McCarthy, Martin Mohlenkamp, Shawn Ostermann, Liudmila Pestun, Ann Paulins, Erik Ramsey, Joseph Shields, Gaurav Sinha, Carl Smith, Gursel Suer, and Katherine Tadlock.

Excused: Austin Babrow, Michelle Ferrier, Andrea Frohne, Janet Hulm, Chulho Jung, Sarah Kaplan, David Koonce, Jody Lamb, Jundong Liu, Krisanna Machtmes, Bose Maposa, Chris Moberg, and Anirudh Ruhil.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:17 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the November 13, 2015 meeting

The minutes of the November 13, 2015 meeting were approved with the edits recommended by Martin.

2. Remarks by Joseph Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe reminded members that the fall commencement ceremony will be held tomorrow at 2 pm. Only one ceremony is being held for all students, undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral candidates. He added that the 21 doctoral candidates who will be participating in the ceremony tomorrow are being escorted by 18 faculty members.

He added that David Koonce met with Colleen Bendel at HR about looking into possibilities for options regarding health insurance for graduate students. He added that she is very helpful and brings good experience from her previous position. He said that there are tax implications for the university and thus it has to be looked into greater detail. He also said that since other institutions have been providing this service to their students, we need to look at some models and explore our options. He said that all of this can take time.

3. Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College

Katie said that the Registrar's office received notification from 800 students who are planning to attend the graduation ceremony tomorrow. She said that since this decision came later in the year, some students who graduated in the summer had already made plans to attend the spring 2016 ceremony.

4. Committee Reports

Polices and Regulations: Martin Mohlenkamp

Martin drew members' attention to the hand out about the programs appeals process that he passed to everyone. Members discussed which issues would be handled by Community Standards and

which would be handled at the academic college. It was noted that we do not have a process for extensions on time limits for degrees. Shawn said that the default process would be followed with the request finally going to Joe. Jen recommended clarifying the word 'days' to business days. She said that it is important for students to have all of this information. Jen also noted that it should be clarified that the college policy would supersede this policy (Appendix).

Curriculum: Tim Anderson

Tim said that Ani and Jen attended the Programs Committee (of the UCC) meeting. The notes and agenda for that meeting were already sent to all members of the Graduate Council prior to today's meeting. They noted that most of the time at the meeting was spent on the discussion about the proposed MFA program.

Scripps College is interested in starting an MFA in Communication Media, however, the College of Fine Arts is objecting to it. Jen said that the in-depth discussion was very cordial and the committee talked about the principle based issues. In response to a question from Erik about the timeline for a response, Jen said that we would need to respond by January 7th, 2016. The next UCC meeting is on January 12th, 2016 and we can then share the information with Graduate Council at its January 15th, 2016 meeting. Jen clarified that our role is to make our views known, we can review and decide if we support the proposal put forth by Scripps, or we endorse the view of the College of Fine Arts. Emilia asked the reason for disagreement between the two colleges. Jen said that typically when new programs are proposed, the proposers discuss options with similar programs already being offered. She added that offering a new program is not about being competitive, but about being distinctive in the degrees that are being offered. Shawn asked if the issue was regarding the name of the degree, MFA. He added that most of the degrees offered in the Russ College of Engineering and Technology are either BS or MS; and that we are not a College of Science, but we grant those degrees. Jen said that we should find ways to cooperate- by exploring options of sharing revenue and teaching together. Erik said that the failure to cooperate could be the result of the School of Art and Design feeling that they were not being represented well by their Dean. Vladimir said that this needs to be handled very carefully. He said that different schools have different perspectives. The fear in College of Fine Arts is that the new program will siphon of students from their program. It appears that the need to propose this program came from industry demands in that field. Sonsoles said that a solution based on data from the field might be helpful in this process. Joe asked about the possibility of a collaborative degree offered by both colleges. Vladimir said that there is a difference between the institutional and conceptual view of the name of a degree. He said that a media expert is different from an artist whose work is based on free expression. He said that communication is key here, and that Scripps College did not seem to have reached out to the College of Fine Arts.

5. New Business:

IELTS: This was discussed at the previous meeting and the handout is a part of today's packet. In response to a question from Gursel, Katie said that the TOEFL and IELTS scores are valid for two years. Katie noted that the proposal is requesting the extension of the current policy to one more test, the IELTS.

Members discussed the option of also using the Cambridge language test instead of the TOEFL or IELTS. So, applicants who already have a score on that test would not have to take another test.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 pm.

Appendix

- The policy should be vetted by Legal Affairs prior to implementation.

Appeals

Upon occasion, a graduate student may disagree with a decision or action taken regarding them and wish to appeal it. In many cases a university-wide policy or procedure applies, or a particular office is designated to handle the issue. In particular:

- Grade appeals are handled by the process in the graduate catalog Academic Policies and Procedures section on Grade Appeals.
- Extensions to the time limits for earning a degree are handled by the process in the graduate catalog Degree Requirements sections on Time Limits.
- Disputes related to graduate appointments are handled through University Policy 2.102 Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board.
- Matters involving student misconduct are handled through the Office of Community Standards and Student Responsibility.
- Requests for accommodations are handled through Student Accessibility Services or the Office for Equal Opportunity and Accessibility.
- Equity issues are handled through the Office of Equity and Civil Rights Compliance.

A student may wish to discuss the issue with the Office of the Ombudsperson to determine which of these (or other) processes to use.

In some other cases, the student's academic program, department/school, or college may have a written policy that applies to the issue. If a department/school policy applies but terminates at the department/school level, then the student may make a further appeal to their Academic College (Associate) Dean, who makes the final decision.

When none of the above apply, the following backup appeals process will apply for matters of an academic nature. Appeals initiated more than 30 days after the student was notified of the action or decision they wish to appeal may be denied solely because they are not timely. The student may appeal, in order, to:

1. their Department/School Graduate Chair,
2. their Department/School Graduate Committee,
3. their Department/School Director, and
4. their Academic College (Associate) Dean.

A level may be skipped only if it is not present for the student's program. In the first three steps, each person/committee has 15 calendar days to respond; if they do not do so, then the student may interpret this as a negative decision and appeal to the next level. The Academic College (Associate) Dean is expected to respond within 30 days and makes the final decision.