Twenty (20) individuals attended the meeting. Michael Alderman, Lori Baronas, Susan Chinman, John Mullin and Patrick Sullivan from the Graduate School attended. Also, in attendance were Graduate Council members Jane Baran, Tony Butterfield, Leslie Button, James Cathey, Larry Goldbaum, Linda Griffin, Arthur Kinney, David Kotz, John, Lopes, William McClure, Jan Servaes, Linda Shea, Howard Stidham, Anna Strowe, Nate Therien.

I. Welcome and Introductions
Chair Linda Shea called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. She welcomed new members John Lopes from Microbiology and Jan Servaes from Communications.

II. Approval of Minutes
The minutes from December 8, 2010 were unanimously approved.

III. Comments by the Graduate Dean
Dean John Mullin reviewed and discussed a few items as follows.

1. Dean John Mullin submitted the Vision and Goals report to the Provost. After it is reviewed it will come back to Dean Mullin to add objectives.
2. A “Doctoral Advisory Committee” has been formed. The dean or designate from each college or school will serve as a representative on that committee. Their charge is to compare our PhD programs and faculty against our peers. They will also review issues above the deanery level. The University is in the process of hiring Academic Analytics to collect the data and analyze it.
3. The process to make the yellow sheet paperless has been started thanks to Patrick Sullivan.
4. Dean Mullin reported on the Council of Graduate School (CGS) Conference. CGS came out with priorities for looking ahead and the issue of career services surfaced. Our graduate students are charged a fee for Career Services and it is not being utilized by the students. The Dean continued to note his concern with the value graduate students are receiving for this fixed fee and it needs to be reviewed.
5. Dean John Mullin met with Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Jean Kim, to discuss her office taking over the student affairs and disciplinary action part of the graduate dean’s position. Academic disciplinary issues would remain with the graduate dean. GSS would be moved under the Student Affairs Office under this proposal. By making these changes it is suggested that the title of the graduate dean be changed to “Dean of Graduate Studies” to reflect the dean being responsible for the academic side of the position.
6. Dean John Mullin has met with Patrick Sullivan to redo the job descriptions and reorganize the physical space within the Admissions, Records and Degree Requirements Offices. Two positions have been eliminated and will not be filled. The reorganization has cut down on the overtime and saved money.
7. There have been two complaints on handling applications with the new on-line process. The issues are in processing applications. The initial problems were handled by the Graduate School staff and the remaining problems are out of the Graduate School’s control due to computer issues. Patrick Sullivan will be sending a memo to all the departments on the navigation process in the next couple of weeks.

8. On December 8, 2010 Dean Patrick Osmer met with the deans of the various schools and colleges and showed a presentation on how Ohio State University addressed evaluating programs before they received their NRC rankings. Programs were reviewed to see which programs should be saved and which programs should be cut and on what basis. Out of 100 programs, 4 were eliminated. As an example, there was one certificate program in welding that was cut. This was a free standing program with few students. Another department was compared to its peers to see why they produced fewer publications. Departments were reviewed on their lack of students and the reallocation of TAs and RAs was discussed. The Ohio State Dean’s visit and was a huge success. Dean Osmer gave the deans some great ideas for evaluating their own programs and this session was very productive.

The results from the Academic Analytics should be very interesting.

9. The fact of the day from CGS is that 14% of all students in the U.S. have taken at least one course on-line.

IV. Old Business
A. Application Deadlines
Patrick Sullivan distributed a sheet indicating each program’s application deadline for review. A suggestion was made at the December 2010 Graduate Council meeting to perhaps change the default deadline from February 1 to an earlier date. Some departments want to keep the Feb. 1st date in order to get the students’ grades from fall semester. Some departments have already changed their deadlines to become more accommodating to the fellowship deadlines and become more competitive nationally. Patrick Sullivan will send out a query to the various programs and departments to see if they would like to change their deadlines as they are permitted to do.

V. New Business
A. Program and Course Proposals
There were two program proposals and eleven course proposals that were previously approved by the ASCC and subsequently approved unanimously by the Graduate Council.

The two (2) program proposals were:
1. Accelerated MPPA
2. Accelerated MA in Linguistics

The eleven (11) course proposals were:
1. Art 575 – Digital Media: Still Image
2. Art 645 – Digital Media: Print Making
3. Art 646 – Digital Media: Printmaking Offset Lithography
4. Art 647 – Digital Media: Silkscreen
5. Art 675 – Digital Media: Time Based
6. CHE 680 – Fundamentals of Cellular Engineering
7. EDUC 650 – Regression Analysis
8. EDUC 727 – Scale and Instrumental Development
9. EDUC 744 – NGOs in International Development
10. PUBP&ADM 597 – Public Policy Internship
11. PUBP&ADM 613 – Public Policy Seminar
It was noted by David Kotz that the programs approved were 4 plus 1 programs.

B. Academic Priorities Council
Linda Shea announced the Academic Priorities Council was looking for a member of the Graduate Council to serve as a representative. Linda Griffin volunteered to be the representative on this council and was thanked by Chair Shea.

C. Bylaws
After reviewing the present bylaws it appears that the Graduate Council has no representative from any of the other 5 campuses. John Mullin will contact the other campuses to see if he can find a volunteer to attend the Graduate Council meetings. David Kotz also suggested we eliminate the wording “ex officio” from our bylaws. After deliberating the issue Linda Shea agreed to contact the Senate Office and suggest that they make the changes.

D. Graduate Council Response to the CHASS
Chair Linda Shea indicated the Graduate Council needs to respond to the Provost with a report regarding the proposal of the CHASS by April 1, 2011.

There appears to be a lot of uncertainty with the proposal for CHASS. The initial idea of the merger was to save money and now the proposal indicates it is not for cost saving measures and that there will be no positions cut. The merger was given to a committee to review and they did not endorse the proposed changes. Dean Feldman is very concerned with the merger. The deans have been meeting with their departments regarding the merger. Arthur Kinney indicated there were 2 departments for the merger and 9 against it in his college (HFA). It appears more discussion needs to take place. Comments from council members include the following:

- Coordinating strategies to decentralize or centralize both have advantages.
- Having a larger structure might be better in some ways and may not in others.
- Having a larger structure may mean less access to the dean.
- Would there be more assistant deans and bureaucracy?
- There will be no extra money to make the merger work.
- There is a need for funding for graduate students and how will that happen?
- There might be new ways to created IGERTs and certificates when the merger takes place.
- The Professional Science Masters degree may thrive with the merger.
- What would the future of degree programs, degree certificates and IGERTs be?
- Funding issues of all kinds.
- Breaking down the silos between departments.
- Some council members would like more detailed data on how the merger is to work.
- In general we know, as suggested by empirical evidence, that small organizations are better than larger ones, fewer departments are better than many, and decision-making is more effective at the lowest level. So why are we going larger? Is it because AAU looks at larger institutions?
- On-line education was not mentioned at all in the report.
- How does the merger benefit graduate education?

There are pros and cons to the merger and the Graduate Council needs to draw a conclusion and response to the Provost. After a lengthy discussion, Lori Baronas was asked to send out an email to all the council members asking for the top 5 or 6 strengths and 5 or 6 weaknesses of the
proposal and also for the areas or issues that will not be effected at all. The responses will be
gathered and distributed at the next council meeting for discussion so a response can go to the
Provost for the April 1\textsuperscript{st} deadline. The GC is to focus primarily on the impact of the merger on
graduate education.

E. CORI Issues
The Student Affairs Office has put a question on their application asking whether an applicant
has committed a felony. If the answer comes back yes, they would request further information
from the applicant. The Graduate School questions who should take the information? Should the
information be kept in the Graduate School or given to the departments? The Board of Trustees
is requiring the University to address this issue. John Mullin asked Patrick Sullivan to develop a
model for the next Graduate Council meeting with departmental responses and show the mandate
from Trustees.

VI. Committee Reports
There were no committee reports.

VII. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Baronas