

**GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
January 26, 2009**

**The following members were present:** David Johnson, English, Chair; Nancy Marcus, Dean, Graduate Studies; Sudhir Aggarwal, Computer Science; Ulla Bunz, Communication; Gary Burnett, Information; Bill Fredrickson, Music; Flip Froelich, Oceanography; Marc Gertz, Criminology; Stanley Gontarski, English; Victor Mesev, Social Sciences; Colleen Muscha, Theatre; Dianne Speake, Nursing; Molly Wasko, Business

**The following members were absent – alternatives present are listed in parentheses:** Valliere Richard Auzenne, Film; Kathleen Erndl, Religion; Jim Hinterlong, Social Work; Ithel Jones, Teacher Education; Susan Lynn, Education; David MacPherson, Economics; Andy Mauk, Education; (Dan Markel), Law; Ron Mullis, Human Sciences; Randy Rill, Medicine; Rodney Roberts, Engineering; Lee Stepina, Business; Jason Fishbein, Graduate Student Representative, Congress of Graduate Students

**Also present:** Anne Rowe, Dean of Faculties; Judy Devine, Associate Dean, Office of Graduate Studies; Monica Esquibel, Graduate Studies; Joseph McElrath, Academic Affairs

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 P.M. **A quorum was present.**

The **12-01-08 minutes** were approved by the committee without any changes.

Dr. Johnson reported that the document the GPC had approved regarding the minimum number of committee members on a dissertation supervisory committee and the role of the University Representative was approved by the Faculty Senate on January 21, 2009.

Dr. Marcus asked the GPC if they would like to express an opinion on when and how soon they would like to see this policy implemented; especially with respect to the numbers of faculty on a doctoral committee, who it will apply to and how soon. Questions were raised about how implementation would affect current students. Dr. Marcus stated that this would only affect students that do not already have a committee formed.

**Discussion of GFS Criteria – Revisited** – Dr. Johnson explained that he has handed out a slightly revised version of a document produced by the GPC last semester that deals with the Faculty Handbook language pertaining to GFS. It was sent to the units as an example of what it might look like as an implementation of the policy that was passed last spring. Dr. Johnson stated that he added two things to this document, indicated in bold font, under the section titled “Graduate Faculty Status (Tenured and Tenure-Earning Faculty): Membership and Appointment.”

Dr. Marcus stated that the following sentence is not clear whether this precludes courtesy appointments.

Under special circumstances qualified persons who are not regular members of the FSU tenured and tenure-earning faculty may be appointed to Graduate Faculty Status under the above procedures.

Dr. Marcus expressed concern because it does not indicate qualified persons of the FSU faculty. Courtesy appointments cannot be given GFS and this is not made clear in this sentence. Dr. Marcus suggested the sentence be re-worded to designate who “qualified persons” are. The sentence would read:

Under special circumstances qualified persons of FSU faculty who are not regular members of the FSU tenured and tenure-earning faculty may be appointed to Graduate Faculty Status under the above procedures.

**It was motioned by Professor Gertz and seconded by Professor Markel to accept the document with the friendly amendment suggested by Dr. Marcus.**

**Passed**

Dr. Johnson explained that he has handed out a proposed draft of the follow-up memo which would provide a kind of loose template for the minimum elements that have to be included in the GFS criteria. Dr. Johnson explained that in order to complete implementation of GFS this semester, a follow-up memo needed to be sent.

In response to the proposed draft memo, Dr. Marcus stated that the new GFS policy has not technically gone into effect and the old processes involving faculty status are still being followed.

Dr. Marcus stated that she disagrees with the minimum standard the GPC is setting for GFS. It is Dean Marcus' belief that what the GPC has essentially done is eliminated MDS and DDS and are simply retaining GFS. It is her impression that there is no change in the old GFS and what the GPC is now calling GFS; it is the minimum standard. Dr. Marcus explained that that is not what she thought the GPC was voting on last spring. It was her understanding that the GPC was creating a new category.

Dr. Johnson responded by stating that the task was to look at MDS and DDS, not to change GFS in one way or another. The intent was specifically to examine whether DDS and MDS were things that needed to be retained, modified, or thrown out.

Dr. Marcus stated that she finds the following sentence confusing: "GFS resides at the top of the University and is not granted by the individual departments." If it really resides at the top of the University, the idea that it cannot be taken away does not make sense. The reason being that status is different from the appointment. It is a category awarded to a faculty member and therefore, if there are certain reasons that would warrant it being taken away, then that is possible. With GFS, nomination takes place at the department level, is approved by the college dean, and then final approval is at the level of the Graduate School. Seeking approval at the level of the Dean of the Graduate School suggests that there would be some process at that level that would review situations that warrant taking away GFS.

In response to the statement, "...as per the policy passed by the GPC and approved by the Faculty Senate in Spring 2008, this will not be overseen by the University," Dr. Marcus stated that there are a lot of things at the administrative level of the University that are done to understand and track what is going on in the colleges and departments which would be considered oversight.

Questions were raised about how GFS was taken away in the past. Dr. Johnson stated that GFS was not taken away, but that DDS was. Professor Gertz stated that although this action happened on rare occasions, it did take place when the situation warranted it.

Dr. Johnson stated that he took the spirit of this change to be the shifting of the responsibility for oversight of these issues to the units themselves in an effort to get units to define what their criteria are; to allow or encourage units to take ownership of these issues and that they should be held accountable according to the expectations for graduate work. Dr. Johnson stated that it should be the responsibility of the deans and the chairs to recognize and address situations where a faculty member is not meeting those

expectations. Whether or not someone meets the criteria for GFS will not be reviewed by the GPC. However, their will be oversight by the Graduate School.

**It was motioned by Professor Gertz and seconded by Professor Bunz to accept the memo.**

Dr. Froelich stated that the departments can limit or restrict what individual faculty do, but cannot remove the status. The Academic Senate can decide to revoke the status and someone could petition to do this.

After a brief discussion about re-wording and condensing the memo, Dr. Johnson stated that the subcommittee dealing with this memo can continue working on rewriting the memo.

**It was motioned by Professor Froelich and seconded by Professor Wasko to table the motion.**

**Passed**

**Dr. Johnson stated that the memo will be distributed and the GPC will vote on it via email.**

**With no new business to be presented, Dr. Johnson adjourned the meeting at 4:45 P.M.**