

Minutes of the Graduate Board

Thursday, January 19, 2006

3B Conwell Hall, Main Campus 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Ann E. Barr, Beth Bolton, Daniel L. Canney, Rajan Chandran, James L. Daniel, LeAnn Erickson, Jay Fagan, G. Augusto Lorenzino, Elizabeth Moran, Roberta A. Newton, Wesley Roehl, Michael Sachs, Jagbir Singh

Ex-Officio Member:

Aquiles Iglesias, Dean, Graduate School Zebulon Kendrick, Associate Dean, Graduate School

Graduate School Staff:

Cheryl Jackson, Assistant to the Dean Kathryn Petrich-LaFevre, Senior Editor Michael Toner, Research Associate

Approval of the Minutes:

Michael Sachs motioned to approve the minutes of November 16, 2005. Roberta A. Newton seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously passed.

Business:

Dean Iglesias opened with a discussion of the President's message regarding the governance of graduate programs. He noted that the message was delivered to all faculty in accordance with the university practice of sharing policy. Asking that the members of the Graduate Board read and comment on potential changes to the "Structure of the Graduate School" policy document, he asked that suggestions be sent directly to the President. He pointed out that although subtle changes were made in the language, the changes are significant with regard to the power of the Graduate Faculty, who currently assume veto power over the Graduate Board's recommendations and act as the decision-making group. The revised policy is intended to maintain the Graduate Board in an advisory role while returning decision-making power to the Board of Trustees.

Ann Barr questioned the shift in final authority away from the Graduate Faculty. Is this a knee-jerk reaction to one vote? The Dean assured her that the impending changes are the result of 10 years of frustration during which time no initiative of substance has moved forward. He pointed out that the current policy is the only one in the university that gives authority to a body other than the Board of Trustees, whose power is guaranteed by the State. Dr. Barr opined that the Graduate Faculty should have responsibility for graduate education and questioned if the Trustees would reverse the will of the majority. LeAnn Erickson agreed that she was uncomfortable with the Board of Trustees making decisions about curriculum and the like. The Dean reminded all of the advising role of the Graduate Board and recommended having faith in the Board of Trustees to have graduate education's best interests at heart. Roberta Newton further noted that the Trustees have committees that review the recommendations before them prior to sending them to the full Board for a vote.

A cursory review of the revised policy document led to several questions:

- 1. What is the significance of "graduate faculty" vs. "Graduate Faculty" in, for example, I.A.2? Does the lowercase distinction signify a distinction between graduate faculty in the college and those in the university-at-large?
- 2. If professional degrees, as listed in II.C.8, are not within the purview of the Graduate School, why are the D.P.T. and M.O.T. missing from the document?
- 3. Is student involvement necessary? If so, should their time be limited? Should they serve only on subcommittees? How would they be elected? Should they be nominated at the college level by those student governments?

Dean Iglesias noted that comments are due to the President by February 13 so the document can be readied for presentation to the Board of Trustees in March. He pointed out that the proposed changes would bring the Graduate School in line with the operations of the Faculty Senate.

Discussion turned next to the Graduate School policy regarding the use of the "R" grade. Associate Dean Kendrick explained that the "R" (registered) grade is only intended for use with 799, 899, and 999 courses. The "R" is applied for each semester of enrollment until the last when a letter grade is given. No course receiving the "R" grade counts toward the total number of credit hours except for six hours of 999. Some colleges, however, have been using the "R" grade for other courses. This can hurt the student in the end as, for example, a course that might otherwise be reimbursed by a student's employer may not be because the "R" grade is received. Dr. Kendrick noted that the issue will be brought before the Policy Committee for further discussion.

The transfer of certificate credits into master's and doctoral programs was next on the agenda. Dean Iglesias explained that a certificate in urban education is available for 12 credit hours. The program states that any student who completes the certificate can transfer those 12 hours into a degree program. This conflicts with the department's limit of 6 transferable credits and the Graduate School's policy of 9 transferable credits. Reportedly, the Graduate School approved the transfer of 12, although no record can be found to corroborate this. The Associate Dean will meet with the department to discuss policy. Further, a decision needs to be made as to how many credits should be transferred into a program. It will also be necessary to review all certificate programs to ensure consistency. Daniel Canney suggested that only allowing the transfer of 9 credits might deter some from applying to a degree program. But Ann Barr noted that the fourth course could be retaken at a later date if required for the degree sought. LeAnn Erickson suggested that affected students might also seek an exception to have the 3 additional credits applied to their degree program.

Finally, the Dean congratulated the College of Engineering on increasing its applicant pool. He attributed the department's success to the faculty's efforts. The Associate Dean also announced that the fellowship packets would be distributed prior to the next meeting since nominations are due to the Graduate School by Friday, February 10.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned @ 3:45 p.m.

The next Graduate Board meeting will be held on Main Campus, 3B Conwell Hall, on Wednesday, February 15, 2006, @ 2:30 p.m.