

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR GRADUATE STUDIES
AND RESEARCH**

**Minutes
13 February 1998**

Present: Linda Bennett, Peter Bridson, Tom Bugey, Michael Daley, George Etheridge, Richard Janikowski, David Kemme, Kenneth Kreitner, Dan Lattimore, Ravinder Nath, Gene Plunka, Ronnie Priest, Daniel Sherrell, David Wark, and Ann Wilks-Penrod (ex officio)

Absent: David Appleby, Frank Claydon, Dianne Horgan, Gladius Lewis, and Linda Brinkley, William Crump, Dianne Horgan (ex officio)

Ann Wilks-Penrod called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m., and Minutes of the January 1998 meeting were approved.

Announcements/Handouts

- Update on THEC benchmarks
- Graduate School forms currently on-line

**Admissions: Discussion/Evaluation of the Self-Managed Application:
Ideas/Concerns/Comments:**

- The Graduate School needs feedback on what problems arise, evaluation of the process, suggested changes for next year. When forms are revised, what changes/deletions should be included?
- Has the rush at the end been a problem? It hasn't for the Admissions Office because all of the materials come together - things get entered in the system more quickly.
- Graduate Coordinators noted that the applications had been a little slow in getting to the Department. Some students panic when seals were inadvertently broken. Efficiency issues will be more evident after spring crunch for Psychology and AUSP. Whole packets have been delayed because applicants have been waiting on the GRE scores since it has been harder to take the tests due to fewer available paper and pencil test dates. There is concern as to when ETS will have this problem fixed.
- Coordinators for departments using the self-managed application will check with their staff to see if there are additional problems with the process. [AUSP has

reported that the self-managed packet worked well. Things did come in with most of the information requested. They were slower in arriving, but it may have been a factor of getting all materials together.]

Additional Assignments for GAs

- Current policy does not ask for approval of the academic department when an additional GA assignment is being requested. It was the consensus of the Council that this policy be changed. The academic department should consider if the additional assignment is too burdensome for the student. Additionally, the current GPA status should be a factor in this decision.
- When request reaches Assistant Dean, there is a 24-hour review and calls are made to departments if necessary. Delay at that point is dependent on Department.
- There have been multiple GA assignments over 20 hours - there should be none over 30.
- If a student is on academic probation, it is not recommended that they be continued on a Graduate Assistantship. However, they can be approved by exception, which Dianne Horgan does routinely if (1) there are legitimate extenuating circumstances, (2) approval of home department, and (3) if it's mathematically possible for the student to get off probation by end of that semester. [Dr. Horgan does not approve additional assignments for students on probation even though this had been a routine past practice. Also, there is concern regarding approving significant amounts of extra assistant time for someone with a GPA in low 3s. Colleagues at a recent CSGS conference agreed that this was the norm.]
- These processes should be clarified so that it is easily understood.
- On the newly revised request form: change signature line from Supervisor, Graduate Program to a signature line for the Departmental Graduate Coordinator.
- All Graduate Assistants should be advised at the very beginning of their assignment what the supervisors' expectations are with respect to work performed during breaks and holidays. Tell them up front!

Suggested Policy Changes: 2D:05:12C – Graduate Assistants General Compensation

- Clearer definition of assistantships: Research/Laboratory, Teaching, and Administrative.

- Revise the Graduate Assistant salary scale.
- Recalculate the base \$600 per semester requirement to meet current minimum wage laws. This statement met with general acceptance by the council.
- Include exception requirements such as review and endorsement by student's academic department.

Grading Proposal: Pluses and Minuses

- There was discussion regarding the current grading proposal being considered by the President. A project implementation team has been discussing and researching the impact this changes would entail. There is no technical problem since there is a grading table to enter it in the system.
- The issues now are:
 - The impact of these grades on GPAs (4.00 or a 4.33 potential). Is that appropriate? Med and Law schools recalculate the GPA ignoring +/- .
 - Impact of this change on outlying units such as: (a) Financial Aid – academic progress policy; (b) Catalog; C average? 2.0 not a 2.33 or 1.77; (c) NCAA, (d) Honors regulations.
- After the impact report has been written for the Provost by Noel Schwartz and the work group, an academic group will be recommended to study these issues prior to implementation of any changes. Such a group would include faculty and representatives from all those areas that have regulations impacted by the new grading policy, along with reps from the offices assigned to implement the policy.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Nancy Hurley.