

**Graduate Council
September 23, 2011
303C DEV
Approved Minutes
(Minutes approved at the October 28, 2011 Graduate Council meeting.)**

Faculty Present: A. Bostrom, D. Cannon, S. Choudhuri, N. Diarrassouba, M. Harris, V. Long, A. Lowen, M. Luttenton, M. Staves

Absent: S. Alaimo, W. Boeve, A. Bostrom, B. Kingshott

Administrative Ex-Officio Present: C. Bajema, B. Cole, I. Fountain, S. Lipnicki, J. Potteiger, J. Stevenson

Elected Student Reps Present: J. Amisi, M. VanderWindt

Ex-Officio Students Present: Heather DeNio

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/DECISION
I. Call to Order	M. Luttenton called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.	
II. Approval of Agenda		Motion: M. Staves moved to approve the agenda. D. Cannon seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
III. Approval of Minutes – September 9, 2011		Motion: M. Staves moved to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2011 Graduate Council meeting. J. Amisi seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
IV. Chair’s Report – M. Luttenton	The New Programs Council met last Friday. Members of that council include chairs of UCC, FSBC, and others. This council review proposals for programs that units want to establish. Under current New Programs Council guidelines, the Graduate Council chair has no voting rights. They considered adding the GC chair to the group when graduate proposals are in the queue but it got voted down. The council would fix major issues before the pre-proposal moves forward to proposal stage.	

	<p>The proposal review process starts with an outline submission of the proposed program, which is reviewed by the ECS chair, who then distributes it to the New Program Council. They review it and vote to either support the development of a full proposal or to deny it. They make a recommendation to the Provost who makes the final decision. The full proposal goes through the curriculum review process which includes the Graduate Council, UCC, and FSBC, all of which give their recommendations to ECS, and then it goes to the Provost for full approval.</p> <p>M. Luttenton will draft a rebuttal to ECS that expresses the Graduate Council's objection to being excluded from the New Program Council and asks that the decision be revisited. One of the Graduate Council's charges is to consider forming a graduate curriculum committee, separate from the Graduate Council, and this situation speaks to that need. M. Luttenton will explore various options with the ECS chair. ECS will meet on September 30 with the standing committee chairs to review their charges. The New Program Council however is not a standing committee.</p>	
V. Dean's Report – J. Potteiger	J. Potteiger had no report.	
VI. Policy Subcommittee Report – W. Boeve	The policy subcommittee is not meeting today after the Graduate Council.	
VII. Curriculum Subcommittee Report – M. Staves	<p>The GC-CC will meet today to discuss the PAS proposals with W. Boeve. The proposals will be reviewed at the next GC-CC meeting.</p> <p>The Clinical Research Trials Management certificate proposal was approved at the last GC-CC meeting. It includes 4 courses (2 provided by GVSU) for a total of 12 credits.</p> <p>M. Staves provided a recap of the GC-CC's policy on proposal review. It acts on all proposals, to approve, send back for revisions, or deny. Proposals move forward to UCC except for new program proposals and major program changes. The GC-CC takes those to the full Graduate</p>	

	<p>Council with a recommendation and the program proposals are voted on by the full Council.</p> <p>Members discussed their concerns with public announcements of new programs in advance of the programs going through the curriculum process. J. Potteiger noted that the university should take opportunities to be the best it can be, and that senior management wants to position GVSU to remain strong.</p>	
<p>VIII. GSA Report – J. Amisi</p>	<p>J Amisi gave the report in Y. Nath’s absence. GradClub is held every Wednesday. Attendance has been low so far. President Haas will attend but there has been no date scheduled yet.</p> <p>GSA created guidelines on how to disseminate the \$15k allotment from Student Senate. The draft is under review by Student Life. The Student Senate Restructure Task Force has been meeting, and they agreed on a timeline to come together and write a draft constitution. However, it is unlikely that a new constitution will pass Student Senate. The Senate combined GradClub and research funding into ‘programming,’ which is not the right category for those items. The undergraduates believe they can represent all students, including graduate students, but issues like the President’s Ball and gender neutral housing are not graduate student concerns. GSA members believe the process will not move forward unless there is support from administration.</p> <p>GC members discussed strategies to move Student Senate to take action. The GSA could write an open letter to the university community as they have sufficient evidence that the Student Senate officers do not intend to bargain in good faith. It is not the Dean of Graduate Studies’ role to get involved with Student Senate.</p> <p>S. Lipnicki noted that the students have not received direction on how graduate student representation would take place. Representatives from the current Senate came to meetings last winter with the outgoing Senate</p>	

	<p>leaders but did not buy into the process after the old Senate left.</p> <p>M. Luttenton suggested that GSA officers should meet with himself, OGS, D. Cannon, and S. Lipnicki to come up with a strategy.</p>	
IX. Old/New Business	<p>Graduate Council Curriculum Subcommittee Autonomy</p> <p>M. Luttenton opened the discussion. The policy subcommittee would like the full Graduate Council’s support to revisit separating the GC-CC from the GC. The restructure would make the GC-CC autonomous from UCC so that graduate curriculum passes through directly to ECS, with the exception of new program proposals. This structure would allow a continued close working relationship with the Graduate Council and GC-PC. GC members noted potential issues with 3+2 programs and dual-listed courses as these would need to go through both UCC and GCC. The current UCC policy is to pass certain proposals without review if they are supported by their college. New course proposals and course change proposals with no impact on undergraduate programs would go to GCC but bypass UAS. M. Staves would like GC members to support that the Graduate Council is the final word in graduate program proposals, graduate course changes, and new course proposals, but proposals with both undergraduate and graduate components would go through both undergraduate and graduate curriculum review. He does not support a separate graduate curriculum committee.</p>	<p>Motion: M. Staves moved to support the recommendation from the Graduate Council Chair to work with UCC to separate the roles of the UCC and Graduate Council such that they will not act on graduate curriculum proposals after the Graduate Council votes on them. A. Lowen seconded. Motion passed unanimously.</p>
X. Adjournment		<p>Motion: D. Cannon moved to adjourn. J. Amisi seconded. Meeting adjourned at 10:21 AM.</p>