Graduate Council Minutes
October 23, 2009

Council Members Present:

Dr. Lowell Caneday, Vice-Chair
Dr. Barbara Stoecker, Group I
Dr. William McGlynn, Group I
Dr. Allen Scott, Group II
Dr. Merrall Price, Group II
Dr. Rob Whiteley, Group III
Dr. Xiang Fang, Group IV
Dr. Tanya Finchum, Group IV
Dr. Kathleen Kelsey, Group V
Dr. Tim Passmore, Group V
Dr. Lin Liu, Group VI
Dr. Greg Sawyer, Group VI

Graduate College:

Dr. Gordon Emslie
Dr. Mark Payton
Dr. Craig Satterfield

Guests:

Mr. Aravind Seshadri (GPSGA)
Dr. Melanie Page (Psychology)

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 pm by Vice Chair Caneday. Since there were new members on Council, some brief introductions were made.

Approval of September 18, 2009 minutes

Following a motion (Scott) and a second (Stoecker), the September 18, 2009 minutes of the Graduate Council were unanimously approved.

GPSGA Report

Mr. Seshadri reported on several items. The officers of GPSGA will meet with Senator James Halligan and other legislators on Wednesday, October 28. One topic they will discuss with the legislators is establishing graduate student representation on the OSRHE
Student Advisory Board, a situation currently effectively barred by rules regarding the minimum number of credit hours in which a representative must be enrolled.

Mr. Seshadri also urged Councilors to nominate outstanding graduate students for the Graduate Student Showcase prior to the October 30 deadline. He also reported that, although graduate student enrollment has increased, the dollar amount that GPSGA received in student activity fees has decreased. He is requesting a bylaw change from SGA to remedy this situation. Finally, he reminded Council that GPSGA is responsible for securing judges for the research symposium and that any assistance individual councilors can provide in this regard would be appreciated.

For the last GPSGA meeting of the Fall, the speaker will be Dr. Houston Davis of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The meeting will be November 12 in LSW 103.

Graduate College Report

Dr. Satterfield distributed copies of the prospective student pamphlets. He reported that he had 10,000 copies made, which he hoped would last two years.

Old Business

Graduate Assistants Responsibility and Benefits: Dr. Emslie reported that the proposal from the last meeting of the Graduate Council had been endorsed by Instruction Council earlier in the day. Minor changes involving explicitly defining “summer” and providing an avenue for exceptions, originating with the department and going through the academic college to the Graduate Dean, were suggested by Instruction Council. Dr. Scott moved, and Dr. Whitely seconded, to accept the document as amended by Instruction Council. The motion passed unanimously.

Requirements for Graduate Coordinators: Dr. Caneday presented a resolution stating that it was Council’s desire that anyone holding the title of “Graduate Coordinator” should be a member of the OSU Graduate Faculty and be employed by the unit he or she was serving in this capacity. Dr. Price noted that the “whereas” statements didn’t preclude, necessarily, a staff person being a coordinator. Dr. Caneday agreed to rework the statement of the resolution and bring it back to Council.

Graduate Minors: Dr. Caneday reminded Council of the “loose and unclear” Catalog verbiage as it presently exists, and distributed draft wording of a document, created by Drs. Caneday and Kennison, that defines a “graduate minor” and delineates its approval process. Caneday explained that the final approval of minors would, under this proposal, rest in the Provost’s Office since these are not Regents approved. After a lengthy discussion, a motion was made to abolish minors at the graduate level; this motion failed due to a lack of a second. In order for Council to have an appreciation of what other
institutions do in regard to graduate minors, Dr. Caneday agreed to create a set of questions and forward them to Associate Dean Payton, who will in turn survey his Big XII colleagues. Dr. Page expressed concern about the verbiage stating that a student cannot receive a minor from his or her major department. Caneday agreed to bring this back to Council once better information is obtained.

**Professional Masters Degrees:** Dr. Emslie reported that although the NSF funding opportunity for Professional Science Masters programs was not what was expected in terms of its scope and nature, it would appear to still be advantageous for some programs to develop ‘professional’ degrees. Dr. Price objected to the use of the word “professional” in the name of this type of degree, inasmuch as such a terminology could be taken as implying that other degrees were not professional. Dr. Emslie acknowledged this, but noted that this is a standard term used nationwide for this type of terminal masters degree. Emslie reminded Council that it has the opportunity to establish guidelines as to what OSU is prepared to classify as a ‘professional’ masters degree (e.g., number of hours, internship experience, etc.).

**Honorary Degrees:** Dr. Caneday reported that he and Drs. Stoecker, Whiteley, and Price had served on a committee reviewing changes to the policy on the awarding of honorary degrees. He reviewed some of the changes that were proposed and subsequently accepted by Faculty Council and the Council of Deans.

**New Business**

**Graduate Faculty Membership Committee:** Dr. Payton presented a draft of a timeline that detailed the process of conferring graduate faculty status. It included deadlines for submission of nomination forms, Subject Matter Group recommendations and Council decisions. Payton stressed that this timeline is to allow everyone to see the “big picture” and see how the various parts of the process fit together. Dr. Emslie asked Council to consider who should be informed, and by whom, when the Group recommendation is negative. After some discussion, it was moved by Scott, seconded by Stoecker, to have the Graduate College serve as the source of this communication, and that it should be the nominator that is informed and advised as to the nominee’s appeal options. Addressing a point in the schedule (which individuals on the Membership Committee would be responsible for providing the Membership Committee with a preliminary review of which Group’s recommendations), it was decided that for the current round of nominations, the Vice-Chair from Group 1 would preview the recommendations from Groups 2 and 3, and so on, in a cyclic manner.

Dr. Emslie distributed the latest draft of the RCR policy and he asked Council to review it.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.