

**Minutes of Meeting Held  
December 6, 2006**

*Present:* Dean Tumeo, Professors Bailey, Bathala, Beebe, Goodman, Tukel, Oprea, Rudd, Simon, Spector, Hansman, Jeffres, Mallett, Smith, Thornton

*Guests:* David McIntyre, Benoy Joseph

*Absent/Excused:* Professors Bowen, Forte, Gatica, Sola

Dean Tumeo opened the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

**Announcements and Communications:**

*Welcome to new Council members:*

Dean Tumeo opened the meeting by welcoming Dr. Tukel as the new representative from Business, Dr. Goodman from Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Dr. Chang from Social and Behavioral Sciences. He stated that at the next meeting there will be nominations from Arts & Humanities to replace Dr. Leedy who passed away.

*Program Review Letters:*

Dean Tumeo stated that everyone received the Program Review Letters. He forwarded them to Dr. Kaul and they were very well received.

*Report on New Degree Programs:*

Dean Tumeo sent copies of the approval process of NEW Graduate Degree Programs. He stress that this was for NEW programs. There are many instances where programs that are being proposed are spin-off programs. These under the state rules are not new programs and do not go through the PDP process. These guidelines are only for those programs that must go through the Program Development Plan and the Full Planning Proposal process. The reason for the change is that the practice was that the department would vote on it, notify the Dean of the College and then submit it to the state for opinions so the department could decide if they wanted to go to the full proposal. In CLASS, which is in the process for a Masters of Arts in Global Transaction, when the full proposal came to the Curriculum Committee they were less than happy that a PDP had moved forward without their review and approval.

**Committee Reports:**

*Faculty Senate:*

Leo Jeffres asked for Council's advice on the proposal to abolish the Common Hour that is to be discussed at this afternoon's Faculty Senate meeting. This would allow students to take full schedules on Tuesday's and Thursday's. The DPT and OPT programs support having a common hour. They do not schedule classes during the noon hour. There was a sense in the administration that the problem is lab classes, where there is a need for bigger blocks of time. The common hour as constructed on two days prevented scheduling these classes during the day for full-time students. There was discussion on the time needed for scheduling of

classes. Colloquiums and meetings could be schedule on Friday. Dean Tumeo stated that he was under the impression that there would be another time scheduled as the common hour.

The Faculty Senate passed the Doctor of Physical Therapy and the Masters of Non Profit Administration and Leadership. They have been forwarded to the state and are on track for presentation in March for approval.

*University Admissions & Standards:*

Chris Mallett had no report.

*University Curriculum Committee:*

Mikeo Smith reported that the Doctorate Program in Psychology in Aging was approved after a lengthy discussion. They were concerned with the small number of students that are participating at the University of Akron, since it is a joint program. The proposal did not have any stipulation on distance learning. They also emphasized that they need to look for external funding to support the program and the recommendation was made to Psychology that they talk to departments using interactive distance learning. It was approved.

*Graduate Faculty Review Committee:*

Bill Bailey reported that the Graduate Faculty Review Committee reviewed 52 applications. The are recommendations are for one-Year Interim Appointments, initial three-year appointments, one-year extensions pending approved guidelines, and five-year appointments. Since this is a recommendation of a standing committee motions are not needed. The recommendation of one-year interim appointments was unanimously approved. The recommendation for approval of the initial three-year appointments for three faculty members was unanimously approved. The five-year appointment under approved guidelines was unanimously approved. The recommendation for one-year extension for two persons pending approval of CLASS guidelines was unanimous.

*Research Council:*

Jill Rudd reported that the Research Council has put forward the Faculty Research Development Grant application guidelines. They are on line. The proposals are due to the academic Deans on February 12<sup>th</sup>. There will be workshops on the EFRD Grants. Dean Tumeo asked Council members to spread the word.

**Old Business:**

*Approval of Minutes of Graduate Council Meeting – Should a full or summary format be used?*

Dean Tumeo reminded Council members that at the last meeting there was a discussion on summary versus word by word format for the Graduate Council minutes. Council members wanted to hear from Dr. Leedy and clearly this is not going to happen. It is up to the Council whether they want the summary or the word by word format. The recommendation was made for the preference of a summary format. There was no opposition.

Dr. Jeffres stated that Dr. Leedy should be a wonderful example of someone even at that point in his life was still engaged in caring about his institution. This is a place of commuter faculty as well as commuter students. Here is Walter nearing the end of his life still engaged and concerned with something like this. This speaks to the person and to his loyalty to the Institution; in this case it is Graduate Council. Dean Tumeo responded that he was a joy to work with and will be sorely missed.

**New Business:***Graduate Faculty Status Criteria for the College of Business:*

Dean Tumeo stated that Dr. McIntyre has concerns regarding the Graduate Faculty criteria being submitted by the College of Business. He asked to present his concerns to Council and distributed a summary of them. Dean Tumeo stated that the approved Engineering guidelines have a publication in a refereed conference proceeding as equivalent to a publication in a refereed journal. Two of these are required in five years for Graduate Faculty status. The Business guidelines do not include refereed conference proceedings language but does include professional presentations. They are not counted as equally as a refereed conference proceeding publications.

Dr. Joseph reported that the College of Business standards have been changed from the original standards of two refereed journals in five years. There are a number of conditions and add-ons in order to meet those standards. Professional standards are also included for those who may qualify under various areas of achievement. Dr. McIntyre stated that his main point is basically that refereed proceedings in the Engineering College count for half a credit. He publishes in the same vehicle but it is only worth a quarter of a credit under Business. The two areas, Computer Science and Engineering do overlap a lot so it is not uncommon for this to happen. It is his understanding that a person is judged on on-going knowledge and expertise in a discipline and not in a persons department or college. Dean Tumeo reported that Dr. Gatica who was unable to attend asked him to relate the fact that the Engineering guidelines say "Publication in peer review proceedings" and the Business guidelines say "National/International professional presentations". In his mind there some distinction between them. This does not address Dr. McIntyre's concern about conference proceedings. Dr. Gatica's point that presentations and publications and proceedings are different is one that is worth noting. The fundamental problem is that Computer Science as a discipline is different that Business.

Discussion ensued on the differences in proceedings for Business, CIS, and Engineering. Under the previous guidelines the Review Committee for the most part has not accepted conference proceedings. If faculty submitted evidence that the conference was more akin to a publication, that committee would change the definition as to what the publication was. Under that approach the committee would continue to act in that way. They would be fully empowered to say that the professional proceeding meets the professional journal requirement. The concern raised by Business was that other departments have thirty to forty conferences every year. Several of those conferences are peer-reviewed. They are not considered equivalent. They agree that CIS is different. But if this is put in as a line it would dilute the requirements for the other departments. The problem is that there is a great variation in conferences and conference proceedings. A suggestion was made that those faculty members who have this issue make the case that the peer-reviewed proceedings should be the same value as the criteria. This would be presented to the Review Committee as a university wide guideline. It is the Graduate Faculty Review Committee that makes the determination, not the college or discipline. The guidelines are meant to be is an expression of the kinds of things colleges or groups within colleges feel should be looked at.

After continued discussion it was suggested that Dr. McIntyre in his application for Graduate Faculty Status the statement be made that he was opting to be judged under the College of Engineering criteria and explain why. There needs to be a general policy, allowing faculty to apply under another area. The Council needs to fashion a policy statement as to when this would be justifiable and when it would not be. Dean Tumeo suggested that this be refereed to the Graduate Faculty Review Committee for a policy statement.

A Council member questioned the how 50% of a co-authored scholarly book is possible if it is co-authored by three or more. Dean Tumeo asked how likely would it be for a faculty member to only have co-authored a book in the last five years. The response was that it was very unlikely. In some disciplines ten authors submit one article and it comes out as a book and you are named as one of the authors. It is the same as a chapter in a book. This would be counted under criteria #2. Discussion continued on Guideline #4, expertise as a practitioner. Teaching itself does not give evidence of progressive growth in research, scholarship or professional ability. Dean Tumeo stated that with all criteria they have consistently stated that there has to be some kind of external review check on what is counted. Dr. Joseph stated that the expertise of the practitioner implies outside of the academic environment. The one piece stating “A minimum of three years of successful experience in teaching students in higher education” should be deleted. A motion was made to approve the College of Business guidelines as amended. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

*Graduate Faculty Status Criteria for CLASS (pending faculty vote):*

Dean Tumeo reported that the Graduate Faculty criteria for CLASS were returned to the Faculty Affairs Committee for clarification.

*Spring Term Council Meeting Schedule:*

Dean Tumeo stated that we have currently been meeting the second Wednesday of the month at 10 a.m. After polling Council Members it was determined that the meetings should be on the second Friday of the month from 1:00 – 3:00.

*Replacement Council Member for Arts & Humanities:*

Dean Tumeo will ask for three nominees from Dean Sadlek.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

(Minutes were approved by Graduate Council on October 11, 2006)