# Graduate Council Meeting Minutes

March 21, 2018, GBB 202, 12:00 – 1:00 PM

*Members Present:* F. Brown, L. Broberg, C. Dumke, J. Farnsworth, K. Harris, G. Morrel, C. Nelson, C. Palmer, S. Ross, S. Stan, N. White, J. Wiltse
*Members Absent/Excused:* B. Baker, M. Corkish, C. Fitspatrick, N. Lindsay, M. Murphy, R. Smith, V.P. Whittenburg
 *Ex-Officio Present:* A. Kinch

Call to Order

* The minutes from 3/7/18 were approved.

## Communication

* The UPC presentation at the Faculty Senate requested feedback. The drafts have changed, so members should respond to any communications sent by the President that may impact graduate education.

## Business Items

* The revised Graduate Increment Policy was approved. It will be on the Faculty Senate Agenda April 12th.
* The Council briefly discussed the Appeal Procedure (102.15) drafted by ECOS. Professor Broberg had several concerns that were forwarded to ECOS for consideration. Communication appended below.
* The revised Reconsideration of a Rejected Curriculum Proposal (201.30.4) was edited to remove appeal language (appended below).
* The Council discussed creating a list of talking points for the President’s visit on April 4th. Associate Dean Kinch has requesting a meeting with the President prior to the visit. The discussion with the President should start with asking him about his vision of Graduate Education and where it fits within the new hierarchy and relevance in the future.
	+ Concerns that faculty performance is counted by student credit hours. This results in more credit for undergraduate courses. Graduate FTE should have a multiplier to accurately reflect faculty time. This suggestion could be sent to the UPC. There is also no credit awarded for the time faculty members spend mentoring graduate students.
	+ Counting graduate students at .5 FTE was damaging to units.
	+ Incentives to grow graduate education should be equivalent to undergraduate. Graduate education is vital to the mission of the University. It also contributes to the intellectual capital of the community.
	+ Vision for the future- increased stipends, increased IDC returns to program to grow research.
	+ Retaining the TARA BOR Policy is important.
	+ Hiring packages are important for productive research faculty
	+ The Council maintains academic integrity of new programs proposed based on national trends.

	Chair Ross will send a rough draft of talking points to the members for comments. Camie will resend the primer prepared by the Graduate School.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

### Communication to ECOS

Date: 3-21-18

From: Graduate Council, Len Broberg member

To: Executive Committee of the Senate

Re: Proposed Procedure 102.15 Appeal to Overturn ASCRC or Graduate Council Curricular Decision

On Wednesday, March 21 the Graduate Council met and considered the proposed Procedure 102.15 Appeal to Overturn ASCRC or Graduate Council Curricular Decision. Graduate Council has always endeavored to conduct an open and fair review process that includes contacting the faculty authoring the proposal to ask for clarifications, communicate issues with the proposal and seek mutually satisfactory resolutions. We recognize, however, that safeguards are appropriate in the event that is not always true. The Graduate Council has several concerns with the proposal currently before us:

1. Graduate Council has no final decision authority. Our role is to fact-find, safeguard the quality of graduate education and exercise our judgment in applying the existing procedures and standards in the context of UM. We generate recommendations that are not final decisions. As such they are really not subject to appeal. Instead the final decision of Faculty Senate should be the subject of an appeal. It is entirely appropriate to request reconsideration of our recommendation but that will be covered by Procedure 201.3.4 Requesting Reconsideration of a Rejected Curriculum Proposal that we recommended approval with some suggested changes that clarify that our recommendations of either approve or deny are not final. We understand that Faculty Senate may give our recommendations deference, but proposers are able to point out the shortcomings of our process or our recommendation rationale and request reconsideration at the ECOS or full Faculty Senate level and Grad Council would of course take that up under the reconsideration procedure if invoked.
2. We are concerned that the Procedure to Appeal under consideration will make it difficult to quickly respond to request for recommendations. The proposed 10 day period for recommendations in essence would require a minimum 10 day waiting period between any recommendation and Faculty Senate action. Together with a reconsideration procedure more time may be needed. If an additional appeal of Faculty Senate decisions is available that would add an additional waiting period before any decision could be forwarded to the next step of the approval process.
3. In my own review of the procedure I noted that there was no requirement that the appeal be copied to the grad council chair or grad council subcommittee chair to allow quick reconsideration and to hold process while that process works itself out. There is also no time set for Grad Council action which may be designed for flexibility, but would allow Grad Council to effectively block a proposal by failing to reconsider it and not making a recommendation. These are issues it may be wise to address.

#### Procedure Requesting Reconsideration of a Rejected Curriculum Proposal

Procedure Number: 201.30.4
Date Adopted: 4/21/09
Last Revision: 4/21/09/ XX/XX/XX
Reference: [201.60 Effective Date of Approved Curriculum Forms](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/procedures/ASCRC_200/201.60_CurriculumApproval.docx)
Approved by: ASCRC and Graduate Council

When ASCRC, Graduate Council or one of their subcommittees has encounters difficulties with a proposed curriculum change, the committee involved will ask the department to respond to the committee's specific queries.  If the committee votes ultimately to recommend denial of the proposal, the committee will notify the department of the denial and of a right to resubmit.  Resubmission is permitted only if the department is able to provide pertinent information and/or explanation not previously before the committee.

Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate make a good faith effort to work with faculty to bring curriculum proposals into compliance with relevant policies and with consideration to students’ best interest. Review materials must be submitted with enough time for processing given catalog revision considerations (see Procedure 201.00).

Faculty may request reconsideration of the recommendation of a Faculty Senate Committee or Subcommittee if after revision and, resubmission the proposal is again not recommended, and the decision appears not to be supported by evidence or is lacking rationale. The faculty member must make a case to the committee responsible for oversight. ASCRC has oversight for the General Education and Writing Committee. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (ECOS) has oversight for ASCRC and Graduate Council.

Reconsideration materials must include:

* A cover letter outlining the basis for the appeal.
* Evidence that a procedural, conceptual/factual error or bias occurred.
* The original curriculum form, syllabus, and supplemental documents submitted.
* The revised curriculum form, syllabus, and supplemental documents submitted.

The oversight committee will assign three members to review the materials, contact the parties involved for clarification, and make a recommendation to the full committee.