

**Minutes of University Graduate Council
November 27, 2012**

Present: Alan Dyer (AG), Christopher Livingston (ARCH), Anne Christensen (BUS), Nic Ward (ENGR), Ron Larsen (Grad School), Jean Shreffler-Grant (NURS), Yves Idzerda (Science), Kathryn Plymesser (Student).

Also attending: Graduate School staff Donna Negaard.

Not in attendance: William Ruff (EHHD) Michael Reidy (Letters), graduate student ambassadors.

Meeting commenced at 3:15 p.m. in 114 Sherrick with Yves Idzerda standing in as Chair.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes for October 23, 2012 – moved, seconded and unanimously approved

UGC Committee Reports

None

Open Campus Forum

No comments

Chair elect

Traditionally there has been a vice chair, in addition to chair elect. UGC bylaws ask for both however the council determined it only necessary to elect one at this time. A nomination for Nic Ward was made for the chair elect. **By acclamation Nic Ward was approved as the new chair elect.**

Comprehensive Exam Policy/language review/ Amanda Brown (handout)

Based on inquiries from various departments and faculty Amanda brought specific language in the comprehensive examination policy for council to review and clarify. Language under review was pulled from the Graduate School's website. The following policy language was discussed, motion, seconded and approved for change. Language which appears in both master's and doctoral policy was approved for changes in both areas.

Master's Comprehensive Examination

The major department may administer a comprehensive examination which may include oral or written, to assure that the student has attained sufficient mastery of their program of study, including sufficient knowledge of pertinent literature, academic background, training, and ability to conduct research. ~~The student usually takes the examination during the second year of attendance.~~

Grading of the comprehensive examination

The comprehensive examination is graded with either a passing or failing grade determined by a *majority* committee vote. ~~The student officially passes the examination when all concerns and deficiencies have been met and are deemed satisfactory by all Committee members.~~

Failed Examination

~~A failure on any portion of the examination is considered to be a failed exam. A failed examination may be repeated one (1) time. A student who has failed the comprehensive examination may be reexamined once more by the department.~~ At least two (2) months must elapse before the second examination may take place. Failure to pass ~~this a second~~ examination results in termination of graduate study and dismissal from the academic program. Students who are dismissed from the program due to a failed comprehensive examination are ineligible to reapply to the same degree program at any time.

Invalid Examination

~~Examinations held in the absence of the chair or both individuals in case of co-chairs will be considered invalid and the exam will have to be rescheduled. The chair and/or co-chairs must be present throughout the entire examination.~~

~~All Committee members must be present at the comprehensive. Last minute Committee changes based on scheduling conflicts must be approved by The Graduate School.~~

It is the student's responsibility to ensure that all Committee members are available when scheduling an exam. ~~Examinations held with only two Committee members present will be invalidated.~~

Doctoral Comprehensive Examination

~~All committee members approved by The Graduate School must be present at the comprehensive examination. Last minute committee changes based on scheduling conflicts must be approved by The Graduate School.~~ **It is the student's responsibility to ensure that all committee members, including the graduate representative, are available when scheduling an exam.**

It was requested that The Graduate School review and research the following doctoral sections of policy in regards to what is policy and what is practiced: *Written and oral comprehensive requirement, When to take the comprehensive examination, Acceptable age of the comprehensive examination.* The Graduate School will report its findings to the council.

Presidential and Meritorious Awards / Ron Larsen (handout)

Ron proposed council review and create a process and set of criteria that will allow a department to submit a nomination, allow one to two people (last year they were from the research council) to check the nomination against the criteria, and make a decision immediately, instead of waiting for all nominations to come in and then compare them. This will offer a much quicker turnaround time.

The following suggestions were discussed and made by council:

- Candidates will be notified they have 2 weeks to respond to an offer, and will be given 3 weeks.
- The begin date for the review of nominations will be announced.
- Information to students will be clarified to ensure they are aware they need to be on campus to receive award and that their money will be placed in their student account.
- Limitations would be instilled on the number of awards per department, initially, so that the awarding opportunity is fair.

- Awards will be issued until funds are depleted.
- Department head would determine who it is that identifies their candidates for nomination. For Meritorious it would be the grad coordinator.
- Two (2) active offers are the most that can be made to a department at any given time.
- Unofficial transcript(s) will be accepted in a nomination with the understanding that official transcript(s) will be provided in the admissions application.
- Nominations must be identified as GTA or GRA.

Meeting adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Amanda Brown, Secretary
The Graduate School