I. Call to Order

R. Wilson called the meeting to order at 9:39 AM.

II. Approval of Agenda

Action: D. Cannon moved to approve the agenda. C. Grapczynski seconded. Motion approved.

III. Approval of Minutes

Action: N. Mack moved to approve the GC minutes of December 2, 2005, with one correction. D. Cannon seconded. Motion approved.

IV. Report of the Chair

P. Kimboko introduced Mary Kundrat, the new student representative from Engineering.

In C. Coviak’s absence, R. Wilson gave the chair’s report. There were several points to be discussed under New Business.

1) Lack of Classroom Space for Daytime Grad Courses

R. Wilson reported that concern had been raised about the difficulty graduate programs have when trying to book classes for daytime grad courses that meet in three-hour blocks. P. Kimboko stated that, per Chick Blue’s presentation at a Dean’s Council meeting, the main issue supporting this new policy is effective use of space. She recommended a walk around survey to see if rooms are being used when they are scheduled to be used.

Presidential Search

R. Wilson noted that there are six faculty members on the search advisory committee. The GC may want to discuss whether to send a formal recommendation to the search committee.
P. Kimboko urged the GC to attend a forum. There were a number of people who have already spoken out, as she did, about the future of graduate education, scholarships, and the service and resource needs of students as current and future challenges for GVSU.

GC-CC Approval of Courses
R. Wilson questioned whether the GC-CC should continue bringing all their recommendations to the GC as a whole for approval. Potentially, they could go right to UCC, with the exception of new programs and final plans. This might reduce delays in finalizing curriculum decisions.

V. Report of the Dean
P. Kimboko reported on some items of interest to the Grad Council:

1) Research Integrity Task Force
Discussion: The RITF is reviewing sample research integrity policies and research misconduct policies and procedures from other institutions. Items the task force is considering are: what research integrity means; the sorts of pressures that arise in a given discipline that might lead to academic dishonesty, scholarly short-cuts, or outright research misconduct (plagiarism, falsification or fabrication of data). They hope to create a GVSU framework and rationale for upholding a commitment to research integrity.

D. Cannon suggested that having an economist on the task force could be beneficial.

2) Assessment and Review of Grad Programs: A Policy Statement (a CGS Policy Manual)
This publication of the Council of Graduate Schools discusses issues such as the purpose of a formal graduate program review and key elements of a successful program review. There is also an extended discussion of continuous outcome-based assessment. It looks at overlaps between the two and also looks at accreditation review as well.

This booklet might be helpful to GC members as GC reviews and approves program proposals.

3) The Whole New Mind
Author/futurist Daniel Pink makes a case for the types of skills that will be needed in the 21st century. They go beyond those that are currently stressed in education, such as critical thinking, logic, and organization skills. He notes that many of the professions that use these types of skills will either be replaced by automation, Asian talent, or abundance (i.e., demand that products and services not only are functional but also aesthetically pleasing). He notes that these skills are still essential, but not sufficient for this century. He refers to certain new skills becoming necessary, such as design, empathy, play, symphony, story, and meaning. Grad programs could review their curricula to see the extent to which they are preparing graduate students with these types of skills, and how this would impact certain programs, such as engineering. These new skills cannot be automated. The author suggests that the MFA will be the degree of choice as it requires this different set of skills.
4) Presidential Search:
P. Kimboko again encouraged GC members to participate in forums so that their concerns and graduate matters are kept at the forefront for the search committee.

VI. Report of the Curriculum Subcommittee
In B. Reinken’s absence, C. Grapczynski gave the report. All curriculum documents from the last GC-CC meeting were passed. This included Ed Tech, Library Media, and other COE items that had been reviewed previously. All requested changes were made and all went through without a problem. The issues previously raised by the GC-CC were appropriately addressed.

R. Wilson presented the GC-CC minutes from Blackboard.

Discussion: The GC discussed writing a White Paper, which is a policy statement on the GC’s philosophy on essential elements in graduate programs and courses. This paper would inform the grad directors, faculty in grad programs and other governance bodies of factors to include in prospecti, final plans, and course changes.

The GC-CC will not meet again until February.

VII. Report of the Policy Subcommittee
M. Luttenton reported that the GC-PC has created a draft of a certificate program policy. They will affirm it at today’s meeting. It will be brought to the full GC at the next meeting.

VIII. Report of Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA) Executive Committee
Discussion: R. Stern, President of GPSA, provided handouts including the January GPSA newsletter, a calendar of upcoming events, and an application and instructions for students to request travel funds from GPSA. She asked that faculty copy the application and make it available to their grad students.

Stern reported that approximately 65 people attended the Graduate Open House on January 13. Many students signed up for the listserv to get the newsletter and as volunteers. The event was a success.

P. Kimboko noted that some Health Professions students were disappointed because no CHP faculty attended. Faculty from other colleges, the Provost, and others from her office were in attendance.

Sustainability of GPSA
Discussion: S. Lipnicki indicated that GPSA’s budget request for next year has been increased. Currently GPSA is considered to be a student club.

P. Kimboko noted that the turnover of masters students is frequent which can jeopardize GPSA’s sustainability. Those that become involved with an organization such as GPSA are usually full-time students rather than part-time. The current officers will need a plan to sustain the group after R. Stern and others graduate.
It was suggested that GPSA might want to have a vice-president or president-elect to ensure continuity. Student interest could be maintained but there are always challenges trying to reach as many students as possible.

IX. Old Business
Discussion: N. Mack inquired concerning GC-CC’s role in reviewing proposals, referencing a previous discussion that UCC has been re-reviewing what GC-CC has already done.

R. Wilson and C. Coviak had co-written a draft to address this issue. P. Kimboko had heard indirectly that very strong concern was expressed to UCC by the Provost’s office. GC is modeled after the Gen Ed Subcommittee of UCC. However, GC-CC is becoming a model for working with UCC. P. Kimboko commended B. Reinken’s work as GC-CC chair. It will be difficult but important to maintain that level of commitment with the next chair. UCC is working on an electronic version for curriculum documents which will help with distribution.

XI. New Business:

1) Lack of Classroom Space for Daytime Grad Courses
Discussion: Per R. Wilson, the GC may want to take a position on this subject. KCON has been impacted by the current policy as well as other programs, including SW, MPA, and Engineering. GC members cited specific instances where space is a problem. CHP was told it could not use its own OT lab. An Engineering course in CHS has a lab scheduled in a room that is considered to be an open lab even while class is in session. Another concern was that it may be difficult for grad programs to grow due to lack of classroom space.

P. Kimboko has documents from the Deans’ Council meeting concerning the discussion of space issues with Chick Blue.

Per R. Wilson, GC members should obtain additional information from their programs so that the GC’s inquiry with C. Blue will be based on accurate information. GC will discuss the issues at the Feb. 3 meeting. C. Blue will be invited to the Feb. 17 or Mar. 3 GC meeting, per P. Kimboko’s suggestion to have her attend a meeting.

GC-CC Approval of Courses
Discussion: GC members discussed the possibility of moving curriculum items directly to UCC rather than coming to GC for approval first. R. Wilson suggested that courses go forward but prospecti, program changes, and final plans would come to full Council after review by the GC-CC.

P. Kimboko had heard comments from programs that GC’s process was causing a delay. She suggested that GC-CC should be scheduled between regular GC meetings rather than right before so their work can be approved at the next GC meeting. Restructuring the meeting schedule might be a better solution than giving GC-CC authority to act on GC’s behalf without GC ever seeing documents.
N. Mack was concerned that moving curriculum items through would give power to too few people; and could prevent other GC members from being fully informed.

D. Cannon suggested having an objection period after which the curriculum items come to the full GC. This would put the onus on GC to ensure that everyone reviews documents. It should include a process to notify GC when documents are available for review.

Presidential Search
Discussion: GC discussed whether or not to take a formal position on the presidential search.

GC members who attended the forums discussed the comments they heard, including: the necessity or desirability for the new president to have a Ph.D., his/her ability to relate to people; someone who sees GVSU as a regional institution; and having someone who will wait and learn before making changes. Other areas they want to see addressed were academic freedom; grad school’s potential to grow, how to make GVSU better known outside Michigan.

A question was raised as to if there was any type of needs assessment for graduate education, and to look into why a student would come to GVSU. The Movement Science dept. researched this question last year and found that the main reason was location.

Some GC members had concerns that the search committee might consider non-academic candidates. Others felt that, because GVSU has strong deans and staff, and has gone through strategic planning, it might be possible to find someone who will appreciate GVSU’s current initiatives and take it to the next level. Tenure issues such as service, scholarly activity, teaching, publishing, and so on should be clearly understood as should the complex role of faculty; and how curriculum gets designed and developed. They should also understand how the graduate experience is different from undergrad and that it is an asset to have graduate education at GVSU.

GC members can send comments to the search committee via the website.

GC will wait until the Feb. 3 meeting to put forth a formal statement.

Academic Retention Committee
P. Parker reported that the Academic Retention Committee to which she has been appointed by the GC is just getting started, therefore she had no report.

XI. Adjournment
N. Mack motioned to adjourn. C. Grapczynski seconded. Motion approved. Meeting adjourned at 11:25 AM.

Minutes approved at the February 3, 2006 Graduate Council meeting.