

**UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COUNCIL
MINUTES**

Monday, March 11, 2019

2-3pm

ABB 145

Council in Attendance:

Ahmed Al-Kaisy (Engineering)
Jean Shreffler-Grant (Nursing)
Marc Giullian (Business)
Brock Smith (Agriculture)
Dennis Aig (Arts)
Sara Mannheimer (Library)
Ron Larsen (Interim Dean of The Graduate School)
Nicolas Yunes (Letters & Science)
Yujian Wang (International Programs)
Christopher Livingston (Architecture)
Tena Versland (Education)
James Becker (Health & Human Development)
Susan Cohen (Letters & Science)

Also in Attendance:

Lauren Cerretti (Graduate School)
Emily Peters (Graduate School)
Donna Negaard (Graduate School)

Absent:

Eric Austin (Faculty Senate)
Robert Rydell (Letters & Science)
Sobia Anjum (Student Representative)

Meeting started at 2:03 pm

Feb 25, 2019 minutes

- Livingston moves
 - Al-Kaisy noted correction: remove Tena Versland from “In Attendance”
- Livingston moves, Aig second, unanimous approval

Announcements

- **Faculty Senate update** (Austin): not in attendance
- **Graduate School update**
 - Letter of resignation received from employee Megan Maier
 - PhD Enhancement funds: budgeted for 12
 - Requests for more than 2 were reduced by 1
 - One department scored significantly lower than the others; their request was reduced from 2 to 1

- Meritorious Awards: requests will be reviewed as they come in – incentive to submit early
- Presidential Awards: Due to funding available, awards will be for 2 years instead of 1 (this year only)
 - Renewal requirements: satisfactory GPA and progress toward degree
- IIP: 2 applications
 - Jim Becker and Ahmed Al-Kaisy volunteered as reviewers; call for additional volunteers (4-6 required)
 - Tena Versland volunteered
 - Marc Giullian volunteered
 - Open discussion of IIP review process
 - Access will be available through CollegeNet
 - Request for an email to be sent to reviewers with general guidelines

Old Business

- **Reporting of Comprehensive Exam requirement, proposal (Larsen):**
 - Call for comments
 - Concern that a 6 month waiting period is not appropriate for master's
 - Clarification: current policy is a 2 month waiting period for master's students; the policy revision was originally specific to doctoral programs
 - Concern that a 5 year time limit for milestone exams is not realistic for all programs
 - Suggestion: change to 6 years
 - Clarification of the existing policy: timeframe is from end of entire comp to defense (not graduation); Physics has a department wide 6 year exception
 - Suggestion: if a student is not continuously enrolled, the exams are only valid for a designated number of years
 - Review of existing continuous enrollment policy
 - Discussion that the time limit policy also is in place to make sure knowledge/material is current
 - Decision to change time limit requirement to 6 years
 - Revisited concerns regarding waiting period
 - Prior discussions involved changing the waiting period to the next term
 - Suggestion: put a range on the time limit
 - Concern about an end date, too restrictive
 - Suggestion: change wording to “student cannot take in the same term”; this allows students to take it during the time in between terms
 - Concern with the 14 day deadline for reporting
 - Suggestion: should not be a deadline for this
 - Discussion: for master's, comp is often treated as defense, but is not applicable for doctoral students; the policy is administrative to allow The Graduate School time to input data before graduation
 - Decision to focus on doctoral revisions first, review master's later
 - Q: What should the deadline be for milestone reporting for doctoral students?
 - Suggestion: 3 years
 - Suggestion: varies by department, not necessary to specify a date

- Clarification (Larsen): an assumption in writing the policy was that students' committees are administering exams—plans to review the language to reflect that this is not always true
- Concern with the name of exams; qualifying definition varies by department
- Q: What is the feedback on only requiring reporting of the comprehensive exam?
 - Reporting all exams would put burden on committee
 - Concern: this policy review began with FERPA concern, student grievances, and having a complete student record; only requiring reporting of one exam does not fix the original concern
 - Concern: 5 day requirement for reporting is too short and not followed in practice
 - Suggestion: change wording to 5 days from pass/fail decision
 - Accreditation is only a concern if policy says we are tracking the exams
 - Suggestion: departments are accountable for tracking and administering the other exams not reported to The Graduate School

Adjourned at 3:06 pm

Next scheduled meeting – Monday, March 25, 2019. 2:00 – 3:00 PM in ABB 145.