



Graduate Council Meeting Minutes  
November 4, 2010; 1:29pm – 2:46pm  
Reeve Union 220

Dean-in-Residence: Fred Yeo

Graduate Council Chair: Jim Koch

Director of Graduate Services: Greg Wypiszynski

Present: Sharon Chappy, Ashay Desai, Lisa Dorn, Penny Garcia, Fredi Giesler, Kathy Henn-Reinke, Aaron Knapp, Jim Koch, Craig Maher, Judy Martin, Fran Rauscher, Renae Reljic, Joan Simmons, Jen Szydlik, Greg Wypiszynski, Fred Yeo

Excused: David Bruno, Denise Clark, Susan Cramer, Christine Roth, Alan Saginak, Bob Stelzer, Mike Tippins, Kim Udlis, Thomas Wolf

Invited Guests: Al Hartman, Judy Westphal

The meeting was called to order at 1:29 p.m. by Jim Koch.

**Approval Items**

1. The minutes of the Graduate Council meeting of October 7, 2010, were approved as written. Motion/Second by Craig Maher/Jen Szydlik. Motion passed: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0.
2. Graduate Studies Initiatives Program (GSIP): The GSIP Committee presented the Grad Council with an evaluation form for proposal reviews. The form was designed so that the GSIP can review proposals and share their comments with the Grad Council for final approval. Discussion ensued and Jen Szydlik motioned to approve the document, second by Fredi Giesler. Motion passed: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0. Discussion continued and the following amendments were created:
  - a. Amend to remove the last element of the document, "*No other reasonable sources of support can be used to fund the proposal.*" While there are many outside sources that may support these proposals, the reasons to approve or not approve a proposal are often different. Moved/Second by Craig Maher/Jen Szydlik. Motion passed: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0.
  - b. Amend to divide criteria into Primary and Secondary requirements. It was agreed by the Graduate Council that the four most important (primary) elements for review were, "*the proposal addresses a clearly defined need(s),*" "*the proposal lists clear objectives,*" "*proposal objectives are connected logically to the need(s),*" and "*proposal objectives are clearly linked to one or more of the Graduate Studies*

*Strategic Plan Initiatives.*” All other elements in the document will be labeled secondary. Moved/Second by Lisa Dorn/Kathy Henn-Reinke. Motion passed: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0.

- c. Amend to move “*expected outcomes seem achievable,*” from the Secondary requirements to the Primary requirements. Moved/Second by Fredi Giesler/Jen Szydlik. Motion passed: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0.
- d. Craig Maher moved to approve the document as amended. Second Jen Szydlik. Motion passed: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0.

### **Committee Reports**

1. **Curriculum Approval Committee:** A Chair has not yet been determined for the CAC as all members of the committee have one or less years experience reviewing curricular actions. Jim Koch notified the CAC that the Graduate Council Bylaws contain the CAC’s charge. Kathy Henn-Reinke announced she would initiate moving the committee forward with determining a Chair as there are several items pending review. Jim Koch added that a member of the CAC would need to be representative to the APC, also; however this is not a requirement of the CAC’s Chair. Jim Koch explained the review process of the CAC while he was Chair, noting that each member would review the materials independently then communicate their approval/disapproval through email to the rest of the committee. This process proved to be quick and effective. Reviews are CAC majority-rules; however some items will need to be brought to the Grad Council for approval.

Fred Yeo requested that the CAC constructively critique the Program Reviews, Review Committee’s suggestions of program reviews, and the Dean’s suggestions of program reviews as it would be very helpful for each of them. Items can be overlooked and insight from the Grad Council would be valuable. Al Hartman suggested that the Grad Council’s role could be to address HLC requirements within each program’s review.

Fredi Giesler asked if there were specific instructions on how to review each document. Jim Koch stated that each member of the CAC should read the entire document and state whether they agree with the rationale or not. CAC procedures are not in writing, so committee members should design a process that works best for them.

Joan Simmons shared the APC’s model for review to the CAC as an option for how to review Program Reviews. The reviews are assigned to two APC members who are not members of the department under review. The reviews are kept with the secretary of the Faculty Senate and APC. One reviewer will take responsibility for writing the review and the other will revise and edit. Typically it is a one page review. The reviews are then taken to the full APC who will hear what the reviewers have to say and vote to accept the review unless there are issues. Everyone on the APC, including students, will have to do a Program Review or two a year depending on how many there are.

2. **Graduate Studies Initiative Program (GSIP):** No further reports.
3. **Executive Committee:** No report.
4. **Graduate Education Development Team (GEDT):** On November 5, 2010 at 2:00pm, the GEDT Committee will meet to discuss issues regarding the Strategic Plan. Al Hartman

noted a struggle with the initiatives and pursuing them in the long-term until a more defined leadership structure is in place. When the GEDT begins to phase-out, the Graduate Council will become the leaders to carry out the initiatives. Fredi Giesler suggested creating an ad hoc committee of Grad Council members to form a dedicated team for implementation of the Strategic Plan.

### **Discussion Items**

1. **Distinguished Thesis (MAGS) Competition Participation:** The MAGS program at UWO is currently suspended. Greg Wypiszynski passed around the 2011 MAGS Distinguished Master's Thesis Awards call for nominations. Original works accepted by an institution "in lieu of thesis" (i.e. musical compositions, published books, works of art, computer software, etc.) may not be nominated. Judy Martin noted that students within the MSW program would also be disqualified also due to the program's timeline. In the past, the Grad Council suspended MAGS as they did not want to only support the same 2-3 programs. Instead, the Grad Council decided to focus on more inclusive options such as "Celebration of Scholarship."

Lisa Dorn suggested we continue the MAGS award for those who qualify, but find a separate option for those students who do not. Jim Koch asked if this would be an award specific to those who do not qualify for MAGS, or if the award would be for all students. Fredi Giesler asked if we could continue to participate in MAGS and talk about other funding issues at a later date. Greg Wypiszynski noted that a standing committee to review applications would need to be formed and refined; however, the deadline for the current year has already passed. Jen Szydlak moved to resume participating in MAGS Distinguished Thesis competition, second by Craig Maher. Motion passed: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0. The conversation regarding a separate recognition in addition to the MAGS competition will be continued next spring.

2. Greg Wypiszynski asked all Graduate Program Coordinators to notify the Graduate Studies Office of any programmatic changes that do not require curricular action. Jim Koch suggested each program forward copies of their departmental meeting minutes to the Graduate Studies Office as a way to keep them informed. Fredi Giesler asked if an intranet could be set up similar to COLS where each department can upload their minutes whenever available. Jim Koch stated that a university-wide intranet is underway, and the Grad Council could look into a shared intranet when it becomes available.

### **Dean-in-Residence Report** No Report.

The meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m. The next Graduate Council meeting is December 2, 2010, 1:20 – 2:50 p.m., in Reeve Union 215.

Marci Nondorf, Recorder

Copies to:

Graduate Council

Provost Lane Earns

Deans

Office of Graduate Studies Staff: Connie Schuster, Nancy Vincent