

**Graduate Council  
March 27, 2009  
303C DEV  
Approved Minutes**

**Faculty Present:** S. Borders, P. Jorgensen, V. Long, M. Luttenton, P. Mudde, R. Smith-Colton, M. Staves, D. Vaughn, R. Wilson  
**Absent:** D. Cannon, C. Coviak, C. Mader

**Administrative Ex-Officio Present:** C. Bajema, B. Cole, I. Fountain, N. Giardina, T. James-Heer, P. Kimboko, S. Lipnicki, J. Montag

**Elected Student Reps Present:** M. Gray  
**Absent:** M. Soltis

**Ex-Officio Students Present:** T. Valdez

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/DECISION
<b>I. Call to Order</b>	M. Luttenton called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM.	
<b>II. Approval of Agenda</b>		<b>Motion:</b> P. Jorgensen moved to approve the agenda. R. Wilson seconded. Agenda approved unanimously.
<b>III. Approval of Minutes of February 27, 2009.</b>		<b>Motion:</b> P. Jorgensen moved to approve the Graduate Council minutes of February 27, 2009. R. Wilson seconded. Minutes approved unanimously.
<b>IV. Report of the Chair</b>	M. Luttenton reported on the status of the Proposal to Establish Standard Expectations for Adjunct Faculty and Clinical Faculty Engaged in Graduate Education. It was presented to the Deans Council at their last meeting. The deans requested a change to include a rationale for requiring the graduate dean's approval of distinguished appointments.	

	<p>The GC discussed potential problems with distinguished appointments. The definition of someone who is considered distinguished is vague, and winning an award would not necessarily qualify them to teach at graduate level. Such appointments should require additional scrutiny by the university, such as by the graduate dean.</p> <p>The language in the document is meant to direct the deans to make responsible appointments, not to make the graduate dean the appointing officer. The graduate dean would not “approve” the appointments but would monitor and inform regarding standards.</p> <p>It was suggested to leave the policy as is and revisit it later. Other suggestions were to require distinguished appointments to be reviewed after one year rather than three, or to eliminate the exception for distinguished appointments from the policy.</p> <p>After the vote, the GC continued its discussion. Reasons for objections to approve the motion were that there need to be parameters for those who are considered distinguished, such as having the ability to be a good instructor, having qualifying experience, and defining what this means.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> M. Luttenton moved to approve the addition of language submitted by the deans to allow distinguished appointments who do not otherwise meet the criteria required of adjunct faculty (4- Yes, 4-No, 1-Undecided).</p> <p>After discussion, GC re-voted on the motion. Motion passed (5- Yes, 1- No, 2-Abstain).</p>
<p><b>V. Report of the Dean</b></p>	<p>The Dean’s report included a handout and discussion of the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduate Enrollment Management Team Activities: Graduate Program Capacity Study, Active Admissions, OnBase, Grad Program Director Guidebook, Graduate Program Student Handbook Template, Graduate Recruitment Workshop Feedback</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deans’ Meetings Regarding Graduate Education</li> <li>• GVSU’s First MAGS Distinguished Master’s Thesis Award Nominee Selection Process</li> <li>• Upcoming Events: Michigan Graduate Education Week, Michigan Graduate Education Day, Graduate Student Celebration, Graduate Assistantships</li> </ul> <p>GC members reviewed the handout, submitted as part of the Dean’s Report, “Proposed Duties of Graduate Director, Master of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership.” Mark Hoffman developed the document for SPNA to justify why a graduate director should get release time.</p>	
<p><b>VI. Curriculum Subcommittee Report</b></p>	<p>M. Staves gave the report in C. Coviak’s absence. The GC-CC met twice since the last GC meeting on February 27<sup>th</sup>. At the March 13 meeting, they evaluated fifteen proposals, and approved the following: a program change in the Master of Criminal Justice program, 1 new course, 11 course changes, and 2 course drops. The program change was reviewed with its courses. Two KCON proposals were also reviewed.</p> <p>S. Borders addressed the GC-CC’s concerns about its role in approving graduate curriculum. There is a need for reviewing the market for and viability of programs, as, once a program is approved, it is approved indefinitely. No information is presented to the committee about how many students are served, the reason for offering the course or program, and so on. They don’t collect data on how many students will be enrolling. If there isn’t sufficient enrollment, they offer the course once a year.</p> <p>Per N. Giardina, each unit conducts a self-study. They evaluate whether their programs are producing student outcomes that their program goals identify.</p>	
<p><b>VII. Policy Subcommittee</b></p>	<p>R. Wilson reported that the GC-PC continues to work on a graduate</p>	

<b>Report</b>	glossary of terms. D. Cannon is writing a draft on a graduate education audit, which is still in discussion. S. Lipnicki and R. Wilson are working on an academic review policy and hope to have it ready for the last GC meeting on April 24 <sup>th</sup> . The draft policy on conditional and provisional admissions is still being discussed.	
<b>VIII. Report of GPSA</b>	<p>GPSA worked with the webteam to get the GPSA officer elections posted. M. Soltis, two CSAL students, and T. Valdez are candidates.</p> <p>GPSA is sponsoring the “Beyond the Graduate Degree” employer panel scheduled for April 14<sup>th</sup>. This event co-sponsored by Career Services and, Pew Campus Student Services. It will feature panelists from nonprofit organizations and government agencies. The purpose is to provide information on the kinds of competencies employers are looking for and what they would expect from someone with a graduate degree.</p>	
<b>IX. New Business – Online Graduate Programs</b>	<p>N. Giardina reported that the task force for developing online programs submitted its recommendations to Kristine Mulledore and the Provost. ECS discussed the report. It might be on today’s UAS agenda. It should be available for review on the faculty governance BlackBoard.</p> <p>The task force ensured that graduate education was represented. They reviewed the curriculum white paper and the NCA criteria for creating online graduate programs. Some issues were beyond the scope of the task force’s charge. This means that COE’s proposal for an online program may not move forward until policies are put in place.</p>	
<b>X. Old Business</b>	There was no old business.	
<b>XI. Adjournment</b>		<b>Motion:</b> V. Long moved to adjourn. M. Staves seconded. Meeting adjourned at 10:55 AM.

Minutes approved at the April 24, 2009 Graduate Council meeting.