Present: Jack Barbera, Matt Birnbaum, Linda Black, Rashida Banerjee, Shanda Crowder (end of meeting), Marcus Embry, Wendy Highby, Jennifer Harding-Dekam, Angela Henderson, Heng-Yu Ku, Melissa Malde, Lori Peterson, Carissa Reddick, Tod Sedbrook, Rhonda Squires, Joyce Weil, Marlene Schuman, recording secretary
Absent: Anthony Armenta, Dianna Gray, Pat Seaton

I. Approval of Agenda
Matt Birnbaum called the meeting to order with a quorum of members present. Matt asked for a motion to approve the agenda for today. Marcus motioned to approve the agenda as presented and Rashida seconded. Motion carries.

II. Approval of Minutes
Matt asked for a motion to approve the minutes of 1/24/2013. Marcus motioned to approve the minutes and Rashida seconded. The motion carries.

III. Guest Speakers
• Program Review Guidelines – Kim Black (unable to attend due to a last minute meeting.
• Jack reported on a meeting with Linda and Kim and some of the feedback for the comprehensive program review. There were still many questions regarding the role of the Graduate Council. After much discussion some of the major points were:
  • What is the role of GC in the process and is it meaningful?
  • Does the GD need their role in the process?
  • What level of participation should the GC be in the Review and the time involved?
  • Where does GC enter the process?
  • Do programs want review by this Body?
  • Additionally once defined it would require changes to GC bylaws such as defining role of this body and what the process would be and how members of program review would work within the academic program review work.
• Jack will distribute information to the Biology program with revisions of the guidelines for suggestions and current review process with feedback for the next GC meeting.
• Matt suggestions all members of the GC read the guidelines so at the next meeting of the GC with Kim Black present so a decision can be made to move forward.
• Student’s Intellectual Property presentation by Teresa McDevitt. Currently there are no policies around student’s rights and only recognizes faculty rights. This has created some issues as to what rights students may have over the collection of data in a laboratory, over the research perform and the publishing of student’s work. Teresa provided some samples of faculty/student agreements on publishing of work for different Universities. Many of these have come about because of student complaints, students being coherced into collecting data and publishing. What is the message it sends to students. Marcus suggestion contact with Dan Satrinana regarding information on litigation and what parameters to set. Specific questions around ownership of the data with boundaries and stipulations; who owns the creation of the ideas; how does federal funding and grant money affect ownership; what happens with dual advisors? It was suggested to collect samples from disciplines on the general principals and contact programs for contracts and how boundaries are set. GC would like queries to all grad programs for information regarding authorship guidelines and agreements between students/faculty regarding dissertation and research and to contact faculty chairs regarding creative works and/or intellectual program rights. It was also suggested to contact CSU, CU, look at Colorado law and Federal Law in regard to rights. Teresa will scan all the information she presented for the council. This will be brought back to GC for the meeting in April.
IV. Announcements

- **Dean’s remarks – Linda Black**
  Dean Black presented copies of the Graduate Student Quality of Life Survey and the Exit Survey report. This is the second year the reports and data have been produced. Dr. Black also noted that Sonja Rizzolo and Sara Knippenberg will be presenting the Quality of Life report at the American Psychology Association conference in August. This is quite an honor for Sonja and Sara and the University.

Dean Black also states there was a need for a GC member on the M. Lucille Harrison Award committee. Marcus volunteered to be the GC member.

Dean Black also reported the Graduate School is celebrating its 100 year anniversary of the first graduation of graduate students with a Century of Scholars Celebration April 5th. She directed council to the Century of Scholars website and asked for nominations for different awards. Please review the different awards and make a nomination.

- **Chair’s remarks – Matt Birnbaum**
  Matt reported on the response for the new workshops and proposal for DRE. Some of the comments expressed concerns with the new procedure but mostly comments were positive. More discussion and action appears under Action/Discussion Items.

V. Standing Committee Reports

- **Faculty Senate – Marcus**
  There was no report from Faculty Senate.

- **Standards Committee**
  Standards reviewed 15 applications; 9 for DRE, 5 for GF and 1 for GFE. Two applicants for DRE status needed to be discussed by GC. Rashida Banerjee excused herself from the discussion and left the room so the GC could discuss her application.

Dr. Banerjee and Dr. Nathaniel Miller applications for DRE required more discussion of the full council. Both have co-chaired dissertations that have not yet defended. In Dr. Banerjee’s case, the student had defended the proposal and started work on the rest of the document but had to take a leave of absence for personal reasons. Dr. Miller currently holds DRE status and is applying for renewal. He co-chaired one committee in the last five years but that student did not finish the degree. To be consistent, we should deny both applications for DRE status since we have required others to have chaired a dissertation that was successfully defended. However, the language in the Graduate Faculty Guidelines is not clear that defending the dissertation is actually a requirement.

The language in the guidelines reads:

To qualify for a full-term appointment the faculty member must fully meet the criteria for Graduate Faculty and the following:

1. **Research Advising Standards**

   The faculty member must have prior service as a chair or co-chair on a doctoral committee at UNC or at another institution within the past five years.

Therefore, Standards is in a quandary about how to act: stay consistent and deny DRE status or go by the wishy-washy language in the guidelines, assume that enough work was done on the dissertations to justify the title of ‘Co-Chair’ and grant DRE status. After a short discussion it was recommended by GC to approve GF status for Dr. Banerjee and Dr. Miller.

The Standards committee approved 6 DRE applications, 7 GF applications, 1 GFE application and denied 1 DRE application.

- **GSA Representative**
  Shanda apologized for being late but was finalizing grant application for January through April. She also reported she has been working the job description for the GSA position and making a process and procedural manual for the position.
• **Library Representative- Wendy**
  No report.

VI. **Old Business**
No old business presented.

VII. **Action/Discussion items**

• **Dissertation Rubric - Melissa**
  Melissa presented the Dissertation Rubric discussed at the last meeting. The committee as a whole approved the form. Frances will need to adjust scoring to the new rubric.

• **Faculty Roles & Responsibilities – Updated Language – Melissa**
  Melissa presented the suggested language for the Role of the Faculty Representative for the Catalog; it was suggested to strike the word dissertation in the first paragraph. Final language is:
  The student should nominate a faculty representative from outside the program discipline to serve on the committee. In approving the appointment, the Graduate Dean charges that person with upholding the standards of the Graduate Faculty. The faculty representative is a full voting member with all the rights and responsibilities of any other member and must be present at the student's doctoral oral examination and defense.

  The faculty member must hold graduate faculty status. The faculty representative is expected to actively contribute conceptual, theoretical, methodological and/or academic expertise from an alternative disciplinary perspective and provide an impartial evaluation of the student's academic work.

• The email was sent out regarding the DRE policy change. GC members received many comments about the change that were mostly positive. It was suggested that an online format to the workshop might be offered. It was suggested to move forward and recognize that concerns were heard. Melissa move to approve the DRE policy change. The motion was seconded by Rhonda and unanimously approved.

VIII. **Adjourn**
Matt asked for a motion to adjourn. Melissa motioned to adjourn and Rashida seconded. Motion carries.

Respectfully Submitted,

E. Marlene Schuman
Recording Secretary