Executive Committee Meeting Minutes:
January 23, 2004

Whetten Graduate Center - Giolas Conference Room
2:00 P.M.

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:05PM. Vice Provost Janet L. Greger presided.
2. It was moved, seconded, and **passed** without dissent to approve as distributed the minutes of the 12/19/03 meeting.
3. It was moved, seconded, and **passed** without dissent to approve the Doctoral Plans of Study and Dissertation Proposals.
4. It was moved, seconded, and **passed** to approve the request to change the grading basis for EEB 490 to satisfactory/unsatisfactory.
5. Altina Waller provided an update on the History Department's participation in the Canegie Initiative on the Doctorate. Main points included: while PhD is a research degree, departments should value those who teach at non-research I universities; more systematized professional training needed so that graduate students learn how to be a faculty member; the process should be transparent.

If opportunities arise, the Graduate School will pay to send a member of GEC to a Carnegie meeting with Dr. Waller.

6. A visit by Charlotte Kuh, Director of NRC Survey on Doctoral Education was announced. Tentative dates are March 25 and 26. GEC Agreed to hold GEC meeting one week prior to Dr. Kuh's visit to prepare for discussions with her. GEC will meet with her prior to and following a one-hour presentation at the Dodd Center with deans, department heads and graduate faculty.

7. The dissolution of the Geology and Geophysics Department was discussed. It was moved, seconded and **passed** without dissent to reissue the following policy.

   "When a department is dissolved, the Dean of the Graduate School has the power to suspend admission into related graduate programs. Continuing graduate students are unaffected. This is a reaffirmation of existing policy”.

8. DOD/DOE/DHS grants with restrictions on publication and restrictions on the participation of foreign nationals (including ITAR law) were discussed. Many universities do not allow graduate students to be employed on such grants or on the even more restricted classified projects. An example was provided in which the graduate student would be on the project for 6 months and it was very early in his career. The group agreed graduate students need to be protected in these cases. PI's need to be warned that not complying with ITAR can cause criminal sanction. Moreover, agencies are interpreting noncompliance to include letting unauthorized foreign nationals having access to the data (through shared computers, offices or group meetings). Accordingly, a policy is needed.
It was moved, seconded and **passed** without dissent to accept the following policy:

In order for a grant with ITAR restrictions to be accepted:

a) PI must show that graduate student will not be employed more than 6 months. (In this case the student must be off this payroll as of June 04 as stated in the PI's request.) This allowance will be made on a case-by-case basis and is not automatic. Six months is the maximum appointment to be considered. Furthermore, in the future we suggest this work should be done by a technician or postdoc.

b) The PI must give graduate student a letter stating what work on this contract means. Key points are: this work cannot be part of the student's thesis because of these restrictions. The student cannot discuss this research with others in the lab or allow others (besides PI) to have access to the data.

c) PI must prove to OSP/Graduate Dean that no other employee in his lab would have access to the data; the PI must prove that the work and resulting data will not be discussed in group meetings.

d) PI must be told in short note by OSP that the federal oversight on contracts with these restrictions can be severe. Our restrictions are designed to protect him/her.

e) In order to protect the graduate student, it was agreed that the Associate Vice Provost will meet with affected graduate student to go over the implications.

f) The PI and the graduate student should also sign a statement of understanding.

OSP must get a written copy of b) and c) before funds are released.

9. The Special Graduate Student Fellowship program was discussed and how to best utilize the $38,000 currently awarded in $600 scholarships to newly entering graduate students. It was moved, seconded and **passed** without dissent:

to dissolve the Special Graduate Student fellowship award and to add these funds to the current MSP program increasing the award from $7,000 to $8,000.

Departments will be given two choices. They can accept the awards as $8,000 for their students or they can accept $7,000 award with a $1,000 research fund. The research fund will be controlled by the student and could be used for a computer, books, travel to professional meetings or dues to professional organizations. When students are selected for these awards, graduate program directors can select which option will most help their recruitment efforts.

10. Adjournment was at 4:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Broderick
Administrative Assistant