

GRADUATE FACULTY COUNCIL

MINUTES

February 24, 1993
United Nations Room, 3:00 P.M.

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:07 P.M. Dean T. Giolas presided.
2. IT WAS MOVED (G. Anderson), seconded (R. Coons), and PASSED on a voice vote to approve as distributed the minutes of the January 27, 1993 meeting.
3. The draft "Policy on Teaching Assistant/Lecturer English Language Proficiency" was introduced for consideration. The purpose of the draft policy is to assure that graduate international students who serve either as teaching graduate assistants or as lecturers possess adequate ability to speak and to understand English at the conversational level. The draft document presented a summary of background and issues as well as a procedures section.

T. Giolas noted that the Council had several options. The Council could simply discuss the draft and not take any action, it could modify the draft and take action, it could recommend changes and send the draft back to the Executive Committee, or it could approve the draft as presented.

There was brief discussion. The intended meaning of "instructional contact" (first line of section B of the procedures section) was clarified. It was agreed by consensus to insert the word "Graduate" before the word "students" at the beginning of the same section.

IT WAS MOVED (G. Anderson) and seconded (E. Pagoulatos) to approve the policy with the one minor modification noted above. There was no further discussion. The motion PASSED without dissent on a voice vote.

4. A document entitled "Proposed Procedure for Review of Graduate Programs" was presented for consideration.

It was noted that the Council had discussed this matter previously (at its October 21, 1992 meeting). P. Rosenberg highlighted the modifications that had been made in the proposed procedure as a result of the earlier discussion.

L. Mandell asked about the number of reviews to be undertaken each year and their cost.

D. Camaione asked if reviewers would be graduate-level faculty. It was agreed that this was the intent and that the procedure should state this explicitly.

There was discussion about the plan to coordinate these proposed reviews with other external reviews, such as those conducted for accreditation purposes.

R. Colwell recommended that faculty be permitted to confer with reviewers confidentially. A. Hiskes recommended that a "neutral" space be designated for faculty/reviewer discussions.

T. Giolas suggested that a set of oversight procedures be developed to facilitate the work of GFC Executive Committee with respect to administering the program reviews.

G. Epling spoke of the importance of providing a means by which reviewers can make recommendations to the administration of the University concerning such matters as personnel and equipment needs, for example. P. Rosenberg and G. Anderson responded. Anderson stressed the team nature of the review and spoke in favor of restoring point 2.e to the list of objectives of the proposed reviews. The original wording of 2.e follows:

. . . to provide information to university administrators about graduate programs so that they may be better informed about the the strengths and possible deficiencies in those programs.

It was noted that both the graduate and the school/college deans as well as the Provost need this kind of information. J. DeWolf recommended that the procedure include a provision for the President to conduct an exit interview with the review team.

IT WAS MOVED (P. Rosenberg) and seconded (F. Carstensen) to restore 2.e to the "Proposed Procedure for Review of Graduate Programs" (wording as above).

There was discussion. L. Mandell urged that the review-team report become a public document. F. Carstensen observed that making such reports public would be required by Freedom of Information regulations (only personnel matters may remain confidential). Carstensen recommended that the procedure include a measure to make reviewers' reports public. J. DeWolf spoke against such an explicit requirement because the reports might address personnel matters. T. Giolas recommended that the Dean of the Graduate School, with the advice of the Council and the Executive Committee, make the reports as public as possible. There was general agreement concerning Giolas' recommendation.

The vote was called on the motion to restore 2.e to the proposed procedure. THE MOTION PASSED on a voice vote. There was one negative vote.

IT WAS MOVED (F. Carstensen) to approve the "Proposed Procedure for Review of Graduate Programs" with the original wording of point 2.e restored per the above. The motion was seconded (R. Coons). The motion PASSED without dissent on a voice vote.

5. ANNOUNCEMENT --

F. Carstensen reported that it is now possible to create a 75%-time graduate assistantship. Special arrangements must be made with the Provost's Office. Accordingly, four 75%-time assistantship positions can be created from three 100%-time assistantship lines. Graduate assistants employed at least 50% time are eligible to receive health insurance benefits.

6. Adjournment was at 3:47 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas B. Peters
Secretary

PRESENT

Councillors

G. Anderson	D. Cournoyer	E.J. Gubbins	T. Roberts
A. Anwar (alt.)	R. Dewar	D. Herzberger	P. Rosenberg
R. Baron	J. DeWolf	A. Hiskes	L. Strausbaugh
B. Bible	G. English	C. Lammi-Keefe	M. Wachman
D. Camaione	G. Epling	B. Lovell	J. Wilkie
F. Carstensen	A. Farina	L. Mandell	S. Wisensale
R. Colwell	L.C. Faustman	D. Miller	C. Zirakzadeh
R. Coons	R. Garfinkel	E. Pagoulatos	

Sent regrets: N. Doherty, C. Nielsen, and W. Parker

Graduate School

T. Giolas	J. Henkel	E. Sellers	T. Peters
-----------	-----------	------------	-----------