

Ad Hoc University-Wide Governance Committee
October 29, 2004
Minutes

Present: J. Acker, R. Bangert-Drowns, P. Eppard, M. Fogelman, R. Geer, T. Hoff,
J. Wyckoff, B. Via

Discussion on Graduate Curriculum and Academic Standing issues:

I would like some help regarding the discussion of the recommendations we made concerning Senate Charter SX.4.8.2--involving the suggestion that the GAC's Committee on Admissions and Academic Standing be charged with ensuring that appropriate procedures exist within schools and colleges for the resolution of individual student academic grievances. Please compare the overall Governance Report 10-04 at p. 15 with the Subcommittee Governance grad curriculum report I at pp. 9-10. I have modified the subcommittee report, which in part states: "Concerned members worried that this review function would be interpreted as conferring approval authority and might hinder academic units from instituting procedures they deem appropriate for their local settings. Committee members found consensus in the idea that a University faculty body would ensure (as opposed to review or approve) the availability of academic grievance processes in all the academic units. This function could be charged to the Dean of Graduate Studies on behalf of the GAC, but a faculty body would ensure the operation of these procedures." I recall the discussion about whether "ensure" is meant to include "review or approve" but I do not recall that we achieved consensus that "ensure" is to be interpreted as being opposed to a review or approval function. My own view, for example, is that a review/approval function should be a part of the responsibility to "ensure" appropriate grievance procedures. I have softened the subcommittee report's language in the overall committee report, which you will find at p. 15 of that report. Please check me on how the report reads, and in particular what your recollections are about whether "ensure" was meant to preclude the authority to review or approve grievance procedures, and whether the overall committee report can stand as presently written or whether it should be modified.

I will plan on waiting until tomorrow (Wed.) to release the report beyond committee members. Please let me know today, if possible, if you have any suggestions regarding the report. Again, I would like some help with the issue raised above regarding where we stand with respect to the committee's authority to "ensure" (vs. review/approve) appropriate procedures to address individual grievances. Other suggestions are welcome.

Senate Charter SX.4.8. RESTATE 4.8.2: ****what's presently in 4.8.2 should become the responsibility of the committee on admissions and academic standing" motion seconded....**
Friendly amendment: "The comm shall ensure appropriate procedures for individual students for academic grievances....at school and coll levels and that function shall be located in the comm on academic standing" (a recommendation to change charter)
9 in favor – unanimous. (only 9 members present)

4.8.1. --- "regulations" – what does that mean --- could be residency requirement, degree requirements

Add "university-wide" to 4.8.1. --- (look in their report, already added)

MOTION: To add "university-wide" to 4.8.1. ---
Discussion:

Bbd – within the schools there may be additions to policies to increase requirements – this is the body that would recommend those requirements to the council—at univ level

Geer – gac univ-wide council: 1) that people on the council specifically look at Univ-wide issues---

Make univ-wide standards that impact university wide issues

“the comm shall rec to the council such univ wide graduate aca regu as it deems necessary”

9 YES –

1b on Agenda – ombudsman -- -- NO Discussion

2. DRAFT Report: discussion on shortening it ---

Hoff – suggested that we be clear about how much work has been put into this, say how many times, how many hours we met. Quantification at beginning of document....

A. grad curr/aca standing report: it is good – we will cut & Paste it into the committee report— include pipkin’s changes and what we did today

B. comment: summary of recommendations: is it worth saying things that were in complete agreement/or not/

C. Draft report: tim’s suggestion on quantification of time spent

- prom & ten discussion - move up strengths/weaknesses --- ahead of others... thought two should be moved up

#4 on agenda: a)report to senate: send it to carolyn/ and ask her to post it on the univ web page – home page -- should stress to senate a process for how sch/coll /deans should provide input

deans/senate/individual school/coll work together – deans council work w/senate ---

thinks it should go to sch/colleges at the same time it goes to senate

there should be sufficient time for sch/coll to really review it – so their governance can respond.

Simultaneously when submitting to senate/ reps from the committee will bring it to their colleagues---

The gov council of the senate should meet w/the deans council on it—

Bbd - Senate should encourage conversation at the school level – involve the faculty at large –

Fogelman – he wants to email the summary to his faculty and tell them where to find it on the web

Hoff – may be say each school governance body has a chance to respond ---

Senate should find a mechanism to have input come back –

Essential for senate to collect/invite feedback from schools/college governance --- this is not an end point, before that, we need feedback –

Feedback goes back to ?? Senate?

Bbd – senate should collect feedback from all sch/coll Deans & fac governance w/in scho/colleges -- bbd said he's going to disseminate all(summary and whole report) to all fac in his school / then generate a report from his dean and fac council to senate – should be a faculty voice and administrative voice ---

Hoff suggested having them respond to the summary ----

Make deans/faculty responses second part of the report – then let the senate respond to that.

Completion of the first part of this process is sending it to the senate – then the second part;.... Should it go to the pres?

It's not a response document for the senate to use to respond to cnse...

Wyckoff --- do we want to add a preamble to the summary document? Cover page on how comm was formed, etc... jim said yes – intro & summary will go as a package

This is a draft & it is critical to include feedback to complete it.. it's not completed until feedback is brought in.

Larry – issue of being a committee when we get feedback – i.e., reviewers may misunderstand what we right – thinks it might be necessary to meet again....

Offer to senate that we're willing to meet again for issues of clarification---

Shell This will be a draft report – we will have a review and comment period and create a final report? Acker: Not necessary, it will go to the senate ---

Shell – it is time to do that – forward draft and we meet again –

Wyckoff – agree – rather not let senate make determination/change things because of feedback

It's final around our charge—let the senate finalize it –

This is the result of our deliberations –

Ask senate to set up a formal comment period –

This is cc'd to the senate – we're not through –

We as a committee will get info from deans/faculty and filter it through our committee ??

Friendly recommendation - we draft set of recommendations (2) dissemination and feedback (3) reflection on recommendations in light of feedback. How does #2 happen?

Senate website? We need to be clear about who's getting feedback..... let the senate decide how they want to do that....

An introduction that says “in response to the charge” we are soliciting feedback before the final report --- it was suggested that Senate website is perfect place for it---

Wycoff – we committed to going back to our units for consultation – here’s our draft report – do what you want – we are getting faculty input to complete our report –

Our charge says we cease to exist at the end of the semester, so we do have an opening to ask for feedback – to finalize the report before the end of the semester.

Should the feedback come to Acker or the senate?

Fogelman – request that feedback be keyed to a particular section --- we should share what we get prior to our next meeting ---

Bbd – rather have us review comments than anyone else –

Comments should go into an appendix – let the senate see the feedback ---
Or forward it all to senate for them to discuss at the senate floor

Hoff firmly believes that the senate should decide how to do this...
Thinks it’s a senate decision ---

MOTION: we are resolving to submit a draft report to our constituencies for feedback to us and we will copy the senate on this draft report w/intro that says this is the procedure we agreed upon in the summer – to solicit input from our units --- feedback should be sent back to its representatives.....there should be a 10 day comment period – then we’ll meet again.

What about saying after 10 days it goes back to the senate ----(So comments are received by reps of each unit before Nov 15) there after the committee will meet to consider the comments.

Tim wants it reflect that one member _____? Thinks it should be up to the senate—he wants a forum in the SPH to get people to read it

Larry – will distill feedback before passing it on to this committee

Jim - is the process – this is defined as a draft that we’re submitting to our constituents, providing copy to senate, following a period of review and opportunity for comment by our constituents, we will append our draft report in light of comments and submit it to the senate

Wycoff – this is more for clarification/interpretation – we aren’t anticipating rearguing these points --- it is important to tell the Senate that – we’re not revoting/rearguing these things...

Tim – when we get back together – we should maybe amend if there are clearly misinterpretations of this report.

Fogelman – we shouldn't call it draft

Geer – no –

Bbd – this is the completion of page 1 ---

Tim thinks input should be appended --- we should make it clear that we are only making clarifying changes --- we shouldn't change the report ---

LARRY's motion:

The draft report will be distributed to constit for discussion. A copy of the draft report is being provided to the senate – that following a n opp for con groups to discuss and provide feedback to its representat, the comm will reconvene and consider feedback it received in anticipation of producing a final report.....

Bbd concerned w/DRAFT report wording --- thinks its done – how about a report saying “pending constituency input” --

How about: “A completed report pending constituency input”

FINAL WORDING:

We are tendering our report pending consideration by the comm's respective constituencies, providing a copy to the senate, that following a period of oppor for consideration and comment on the report, the comm members will receive feedback from thier consitti and reconvene for completion of its report....

8 in favor / one opposed / no abstentions.

Realistic timeframe: Receipt of comments to committee representatives by December 3rd....

Then the committee will meet thereafter --- possibly meet thurs december 9 reading day.

*****Circulate the 9th 10th or 13th of december as possible meeting dates.

*****How about -- Thursday, the 9th at 2:00 might be good....uptown ---