

## MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL ON GRADUATE STUDIES

October 3, 2006

The Council on Graduate Studies met at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 3, 2006 in Arcola/Tuscola Room.

Members present: Dr. Conn, Dr. Costa, Dr. Elder, Ms. Gupta, Dr. Liu, Dr. Miller, Dr. Morford, Dr. Nelson, Dr. O'Rourke, and Dr. Raybin

Members absent: None

Staff present: Ms. Barter

Guests present: None

### I. **Approval of the September 19, 2006 Minutes.**

Dr. Raybin moved and Dr. Nelson seconded the motion to approve the minutes. The September 19, 2006 minutes were approved as published.

### II. **Communications**

1. Joint Forum of CAA/CGS Considerations for Revision to the Proposed Policy on Review of Alleged Capricious Grades, Thursday, September 28, 2006.
2. College of Sciences Curriculum Committee Minutes, Electronic Meeting, Friday, September 22, 2006

### III. **Executive Actions**

1. None

### IV. **Items to be Added to the Agenda**

1. 06-42, Records Retention (New Proposal)
2. 06-43, MIS 5105, Electronic Commerce (New Course Proposal)
3. 06-44, MBA 5670, Management of Information Technologies (Course Revision)
4. 06-45, MBA with Accountancy Concentration Phase I Courses (Revision)

Dr. Miller moved and Dr. Conn seconded the motion to add these items to the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair O'Rourke called for a discussion on each issue raised at the Joint CAA/CGS Forum regarding the Proposed Grade Appeal Policy.

- Is the University Grade Review Board necessary? Could CAA/CGS/Dean/Provost fulfill this role?
  - The council members feel CAA and CGS are responsible for graduate policies and curriculum issues.
- Should Unit B faculty be represented on the appeal committees?
  - The members had varied opinions regarding Unit B faculty participating in grade appeals. Some felt Unit B faculty comprise a sizable portion of the EIU faculty and should not be excluded. Some felt Unit B should not be included because service is not included in their contract.
- Is "capricious" the appropriate term for all appeal bases?
  - Chair O'Rourke asked the council members how they feel about "Capricious" in the title

- of the proposal. The word seems to be of concern for many faculty. The council members agreed they would consider removing “Capricious” from the title and support the existing title of “Grade Appeals”.
- Should the proposal specify whose role (Chairs’?) it is to determine—early in the process-- whether the appeal is legitimate?
    - Council members felt the Chair could serve as a mediator.
  - Should Chairs’ role in the process be expanded? If not, should it be eliminated?
    - Council members felt the Chair should be involved in the process and expressed concern/confusion regarding the majority of Chairs’ desire to be excluded from the process. The members felt the Chair could resolve the majority of appeals at the departmental level.
  - Is the proposed process unnecessarily complicated? Does it require too much paperwork?
    - Members recognized that the Chairs do not want the additional paperwork but felt the paperwork was needed in case of legal action at a later date. One council member stated his Chair has always taken notes during a grade appeal and feels it is a good practice for documentation purposes.
  - Could the college curriculum committee perform the role of CGAC?
    - The members were not in favor of the college curriculum committee performing the duties of CGAC.
  - Should students’ role on the appeal committees be ex-officio?
    - The majority of members felt students should be allowed to vote.
  - Further discussion of the grade appeal process
    - It should be stated at the beginning of the document that, if the informal conference is satisfactory, the appeal process is over.
    - Revise Step 1 of the timeline to allow students more time to file a grade appeal – by the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> week of the semester
    - Appointed vs. elected to committees – members felt appointments would get more faculty involved.

#### V. Items Pending

1. 06-06, Policy on Review of Alleged Capricious Grades
2. 06-37, Graduate Credit and Grading Policy: Graduate Catalog Revision
3. 06-38, Repeating Graduate Courses: Graduate Catalog Revision
4. 06-39, First Choice Graduate Program Designation and Academic Quality Improvement for Graduate Programs
5. 06-41, Continuous Enrollment for Thesis Students (New Proposal)

#### VI. Items to be Acted On

1. None

#### VII. Other Business

1. Textbook Rental

After a short discussion of the Textbook Rental System, it was agreed this subject should be taken to GSAC before further action could be taken by CGS.

#### VIII. Committee Reports

Note: Dean Augustine entered the meeting at approximately 3:45 pm.

Dr. Conn left the meeting at approximately 3:50 pm.

**IX. Dean's Report**

1. Alumni Advisory Board

Dean Augustine reported the meeting was very successful. The Board has agreed to develop the Outstanding Alumni Graduate Fellowship Award. In order for this award to be endowed, the board will need to raise \$250,000 over a three year period. Four academic departments gave presentations on mentoring, outside funding for graduate assistantships, and grant awards. The Board provided helpful suggestions for the First Choice Graduate Program initiative.

2. IAGS

Dean Augustine reported an overview of a university lawsuit as a result of the Diversifying Higher Education Faculty in Illinois Award. The DFI Award's purpose is to provide education and develop minority faculty within the university receiving the award. Two issues of the lawsuit: Language change from "minority" to "underrepresented" and to increase participation.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Linda Barter, Coordinator

\*\*\*\*\*  
**ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE NEXT MEETING**  
**Tuesday, October 17, 2006**  
**3108 Blair Hall**  
\*\*\*\*\*