

## Graduate Council

### *Meeting Minutes*

September 27, 2016

220 Van Wormer Hall

**Attendees:** Fred Beyette, Doug Burgess, Suzanne Masterson, Margaret Hanson, Chip Montrose, Gary Dick, Kevin Li, Daniel Ashwood, Daniel Gottlieb, James Mack, Tanja Nusser, Kathleen Ballman, Jiukuan Hao, ChengCheng Li, Tasos Ioannides, Angela Potochnik, Jeff Timberlake, Rebecca Williamson, Jun Ying

**Staff:** Lori Griffin

<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Synopsis of Discussion</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<i>Meeting Minutes</i>	The Council reviewed and approved the minutes from the April 2016 meeting.	Approved
<i>Graduate Council's New Look</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The make-up of Graduate Council is now Graduate Program Directors representing each college.</li><li>• Chip Montrose gave the charge of the Graduate Council, and discussed the A&amp;S membership and BOT rules.</li><li>• Academic Committee will continue as the final approval for graduate programs. A meeting is needed between the members of Grad Council and Academic Committee to decide which group will handle specific aspects of program proposals. The goal is to avoid duplicate work.</li></ul>	Discussion
<i>Permitted grades for dissertation and research credits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was noted that that the Grad School moved away from SP grades last year.</li><li>• Students need to be kept on track and see how they are progressing throughout the semester.</li><li>• Discussion on whether grades should be letter grades or pass/fail? Is there an upside of using one over the other?</li><li>• Letter grades could be helpful as a signal to a student that they need to step it up, where pass/fail would not necessarily do that.</li><li>• Letter grades can swing the students GPA, and can ultimately affect competitiveness and sponsorships. Pass/fail makes it more difficult to compare students.</li><li>• There needs to be consistency at least at the program level, otherwise there will be confusion within the departments, not to mention confusion for the students.</li><li>• Chip recommends that we insert a section into the Graduate Student Handbook that the programs will need to follow.</li><li>• Doug Burgess will have to look into what Catalyst can do to help.</li></ul>	Discussion

<p><b><i>3.0 GPA admissions requirement</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full undergraduate GPA vs. specialization GPA.</li> <li>• Colleges expressed the desire for flexibility if approving under the 3.0 GPA rather than putting forth a waiver every time. The argument is that 3.0 does not work across the board. Other factors include where the students are coming from, their history, and their experience.</li> <li>• The underlying question in admitting students with <u>less</u> than a 3.0 GPA is how are programs going to help these students succeed?</li> </ul>	<p>Discussion</p>
<p><b><i>Overload of late certification requests</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grad Schools is consistently being overloaded with late certification requests. Twenty percent (20%) of students present with emergency requests a few weeks before and a few weeks after. Why are these appearing at the very last minute?</li> <li>• Grad School is looking at internal procedures and holding hard deadlines. An option may be to try a <b>series</b> of deadlines that the student and program must be held to.</li> <li>• Students need to be educated on how to follow their degree path (e.g., degree audit, meeting with advisor, copy of Grad Tracker report required).</li> <li>• Student records should be viewed on a semester by semester basis, so that any errors, grade changes, etc. can be handled before certification.</li> </ul>	<p>Discussion</p>
<p><b><i>Next Meeting</i></b></p>	<p>Tuesday, October 25, 2016.</p>	<p>Information</p>