UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COUNCIL
MINUTES

December 6, 2022 1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. President’s Conference Room

Council in Attendance:
Catherine Dunlop (Letters)
Marc Giullian (Business)
Jane Mangold (Agriculture)
Brian Rossmann (Library)
Sweeney Windchief (Education)
Brennan Reeves (Office of International Programs)
Jennifer Thomson (Faculty Senate)
Heidi Koenig (Student Representative)
Stephan Warnat (Engineering)
Katey Franklin (Health & Human Development)
Amy Reines (Sciences)
Michael Everts (Architecture)

Also in Attendance:
Lauren Cerretti (Graduate School)

Absent:
Arts Representative
Wade Hill (Nursing)

Meeting started at 1:00 pm

November 15, 2022 minutes
• Motion to approve by Mangold, Giullian 2nd, motion passes unanimously

Announcements

• Update from the Dean
  o Spring 2023 enrollment currently lower by about 150 compared to the same time last year
  o Grad School reaching out to students to encourage registration
  o GS also reached out to students who did not finish degree but haven’t been registered in several semesters
    ▪ Framed it as interest in return and if yes, what would be helpful
    ▪ If said not planning to return, asked to share main reasons why
    • Finances and campus climate (feeling welcome) top reasons
  o Faculty Senate meeting last week: presented updates on policies passed by UGC
    ▪ Time limit for comps
    ▪ Research faculty as chair
Age of courses

- Feedback on time limits was not positive
- Dean Ogilvie will provide more context for Faculty Senate members about time to degree for doctoral students
- Some members were not convinced there is a problem with time-to-degree.
- Two kinds of responses from Senate, some think the proposed time-limits won’t affect many students, others think that those it will affect the time limits will have a large impact
- Invited Dean Ogilvie back for January meeting and he will provide written answers to FS questions
- Q: How does ongoing pandemic fit into the time to degree data?
  - Most typical delay was of a semester or 6 months according to data from external survey

Faculty Senate update (Thomson)

- Thomson will be chair but there is no chair-elect yet for spring
- 260 emails went out for merit retro-active faculty raises
- Convocation will return February 2023 (faculty) and fall 2023 (student)
- International travel policy has been revised
  - Will address grad student travel and staff travel with Dean Kristoff next week
  - Web training must be completed every time travel abroad

Old Business

- Officer election
  - Reines moves to elect Catherine Dunlop as Chair, Franklin 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7 pass, 1 abstain. Catherine Dunlop elected chair
  - Vice Chair: Dunlop nominates Reines, Warnat 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 7 pass, 1 abstain. Amy Reines elected Vice Chair

New Business

- Accreditation policy language (handout)
  - Current language/requirement is regional accreditation for bachelor’s and to use master’s considered credits or to accept transfer credits
  - Dept of Education (federal) has added new accreditors and has changed language to “national accreditors”
  - Registrar’s Office is moving to the recommended language from DoEd of “institutionally recognized accreditors” and the list only includes regional accreditors with a clause “the Registrar will consider other cases on a case-by-case basis” for transfer credit
  - Should Grad School keep regional accreditation language or change to Registrar language? Should GS ask Registrar to add language about cases dealing with graduate transcripts should be sent to the Graduate School for review?
  - Q: Would Registrar’s Office be open to adding language about GS reviewing?
Yes, probable.

Q: Is there a timeline associated with review? It would be good to be autonomous
   It would be good to get the language changed by end of spring semester

Call for motion to approve change in language
   Would like to have more information. Dean Ogilvie will meet with Registrar and confirm are open to language. Will discuss at UGC January meeting.

• Appeal policy language (handout); discussion
  ∘ Some admissions issues have emerged and led to a review of the appeal policy language. The goal is to specifically include how a student can appeal various decisions (e.g. comp/defense fails, admissions decisions)
  ∘ Appeal policy currently addresses requesting exception to policy and if new language is approved would now include appealing a decision
  ∘ Q: how many admissions appeals do you receive?
    ▪ 2-3 a year
  ∘ Q: How would this policy define “correct process”? Discussion:
    ▪ Perhaps change to “documented process” or “uniform process”
    ▪ Add language that the process is applied to each applicant equally?
    ▪ Each department should have a defined process in a program handbook
    ▪ There is precedent of using language about the “arbitrary standard” rather than a documented process
    ▪ Codifying the process might create more work if other things change—like Supreme Court rulings on affirmative action
    ▪ Allowing GARC to review cases might protect faculty and departments
  ∘ Q: Is this policy change necessary? If it’s so few a year, is it needed?
    ▪ At the moment, GARC has control and could reverse an admissions decision that was made by the department
  ∘ Q: Will the Grad School be held to the same GARC process as the departments are (when admitting prof master’s students)?
    ▪ Yes
  ∘ Q: Would the appeal apply to provisional admits, too?
    ▪ Yes, it could because that is a kind of decision
  ∘ Should go to Policy Subcommittee next for revisions
    ▪ Will review and report for spring meetings

• Learning outcomes for credits such as professional paper, thesis, dissertation credits; discussion
  ∘ Provost Office and accreditors requesting this information to be added to CiM
  ∘ Every program has program learning outcomes—many of those can be moved into the 590/690 learning outcomes
  ∘ If a student officially grieves an F grade in a course with no learning outcomes, student grievance is won by default
  ∘ Q: Could Council come up with language to distribute to all programs as a start?
    ▪ Likely. Can provide guidance to staff in Provost Office to define the workflow in CiM
  ∘ Curriculum committee would have to review tens of courses if this is added and not streamlined
  ∘ Q: Is the document from the accreditors available?
    ▪ FS: not sure but will inquire
o Must be skills or learning developed language
o Q: Should supervisors sit with students and make document similar to 592 document?
  o Push back from departments that this would be superficial and would not capture what they and their students are doing

- Subcommittee Updates
  o Curriculum committee has gotten through large queue, just a few new ones left

Public comments
  o Graduate Leadership Council encouraging grad students to participate in leadership roles across campus
  o Forum on Jan 19, 4-6pm
  o Worked on student bill of rights and requesting addition of work to the bill of rights

Adjourned at 2:30 pm

Next scheduled meeting – spring 2023