

**Graduate Academic Council
2004 – 2005**

Minutes of the Council meeting of February 2, 2005
Approved by the Council on February 16, 2005

In attendance: F. Bolton (staff), H. Meyer, J. Bartow (staff), L.-A. McNutt (Chair), M. Pryse, M. Casserly, M. Jerison, M. Rodriguez, O. Ongiti, S. Friedman & S. Maloney

Unable to attend: B. Joseph, S. Shahedipour & D. Byrd

1. GAC Chair

Prof. McNutt began the meeting suggesting that there might have been some call for her to step aside from the Chair's position. Prof. Meyer clarified what had been perceived as this leadership question. He indicated a concern about conduct, but not about continuation. Prof. McNutt graciously suggested that perhaps she had misinterpreted Prof. Meyer's comments. There being no sentiment expressed about a possible change in Council Chair, the issue was resolved without further action or ado.

2. Graduate Certificate Program Proposals

A discussion of GAC consideration of advanced graduate certificate proposals was initiated. How complete must such proposals be at the time of GAC consideration was a question addressed. Prof. Rodriguez suggested that GAC review should not stall solid proposals, nor allow for sloppy work. She suggested avoidance of extremes.

Prof. McNutt commented on her concerns about the certificate proposals from Educational Administration (approved by GAC 1/26/05 contingent upon School of Education approval of four remaining course proposals) potentially standing for Senate approvals without all the related course actions being complete. She did not want the lingering four course actions to become a substantive matter of discussion within the Senate.

Professors Friedman, Rodriguez and McNutt all suggested that procedural guidelines for the GAC consideration of certificate program proposals, an item suggested at prior meetings, would be desirable.

Discussion of the report to the Senate about the Ed Admin certificate programs proposal ensued. The question, touched on briefly at the end of the 1/26/05 meeting, was whether the proposal should be introduced as an item for Senate action or just reported to the Senate. Prof., Meyer suggested that if the Council believes what they approved was a curriculum amendment, then just a report to the Senate would be in order. Prof. McNutt indicated she would tend to be cautious given that the "revision" would hopefully result in the State registration of three new advanced graduate certificate programs. She was inclined to propose Senate action on them. Dean Pryse commented that from her view as past Senate Chair, since the Ed Admin proposal had been treated as a program revision within the School of Education, the GAC's Curriculum Committee and the GAC itself, the likelihood of the Senate tabling an action item to approve such was very slim. Prof. Rodriguez noted concerns of importance of this matter as regards the School of Education and as regards precedent. Prof. McNutt acknowledged differences of opinion as to whether the Ed Admin certificates proposal were truly revisions or new programs. Prof. Meyer suggested that treating the matter as a revision was in line with prior reviews. Ms. Maloney indicated she would prefer the conservative approach, to err on the side of inclusion (for Senate review and action). Dean Pryse noted that differing interpretations were present. Mr. Bartow suggested that presentation through either approach carried risks for someone to cry foul. Prof. McNutt suggested that she was inclined as Chair to bring the matter before the Senate as an action item, but would defer to the Council's preference. Prof. Friedman noted concerns about establishing precedent. Prof. Meyer suggested that these types of matters should be considered on a case by case basis. Dr. Casserly indicated her support for the matter being presented to the Senate as a bill. Ms. Maloney moved for a Council vote on the presentation of the Ed

Admin certificates proposal to the Senate as a bill. The vote on the motion was 4 in favor and 4 opposed with one abstention. Chair McNutt indicated she would, therefore, exercise her discretion as Chair to bring the matter before the Senate as a bill.

3. Ombuds Proposal

A working draft of the Ombuds proposal and a draft resolution regarding the concept were circulated among Council members. The working draft was a rough draft proposal update provided by Prof. McNutt with questions to be addressed. The resolution draft was submitted by Prof. Meyer seeking Senate endorsement of the Ombuds concept and establishment of an ad-hoc committee to flush out the details for such. Prof. Rodriguez suggested that the Senate might consider the GAC as the appropriate body with responsibility for developing proposal details. Prof. Meyer suggested that the Senate would likely question the details of any such proposal. Prof. McNutt highlighted the identified desire for Ombuds establishment having emerged from the GAC in 2003-04. Discussion of the need for an ad-hoc group from the Senate versus the GAC in regards to detailed proposal development took place. Dr. Casserly questioned why this is to be a “to Senate” matter rather than “to Graduate Dean.” Prof. McNutt suggested that discussion of a broadening of the Ombuds role to alternate levels (undergrad) might be inevitable. She suggested seeking guidance from the Senate Executive Committee. Dr. Casserly suggested the idea might be appropriate for the President’s consideration. Dean Pryse indicated that the partnering of the Senate and administration on such matters is much more likely than in the past. Prof. McNutt suggested that parallel tracks of consideration are possible. Dean Pryse suggested a resolution go forward to the Senate. Prof. Friedman suggested that the organization of the draft proposal needs more work. Ms. Ongiti asked if the Council considers the need for the Ombudsperson to be on going. Prof. Jerison suggested that an ideal model be located. Prof. McNutt asked if a Council working sub-group could be established. Profs. Meyer, Friedman and McNutt agreed to serve as this working sub-group, to be joined by Prof. Rodriguez if she was acceptable to such (Prof. Rodriguez had left the meeting by this point). Prof. Meyer pressed the need for action and a report to the Senate on Monday. A motion was made to establish this sub-group charged with refining the proposal, to subsequently be circulated by email to Council members and, upon no email dissention, for such to be brought before the Senate on 2/7/05. The motion carried by a vote of 5-2-0.

The meeting was adjourned.

END OF GAC THE MINUTES OF 2/2/05

.....