Graduate Council Minutes | 09/20/23

Attendees: Brooke Belisle, Kimberly Bell, Agnieszka Bialkowska, Susan Brennan, Holly Colognato, Kara DeSanna, Michael Ferdman, David Green, Melissa Jordan, Chris Kretz, Richard Larson, Celia Marshik, Jose Moscoso-Nunez, Colleen O'Toole, David Rubenstein, Marcia Simon, Arleen Steckel, Daniel Waxman

Absentees: Diane Bello, Lily Blocker, Allegra DeLaurentiis, Sonia Harmand, Gianna Juliano-Hooper, Hanna Nekvasil

1. Call to order at 2:01pm
2. Approval of Minutes from 05/25/23
   a. Motion to approve. Seconded. Unanimously approved.
3. Chair's Report
   a. Several approvals have come through since the last meeting
      i. Creation of the Advanced Certificate in Human-Centered Data Science
      ii. Revision to the MM/DMA in Music
      iii. MS in Accounting CIP Code Change and Curriculum Revision
   b. From Jason Torre: The proposal to revise the Graduate Council charge is being withdrawn at this time.
4. Old business
   a. Academic Judiciary
      i. Last year, a revised academic judiciary policy was approved
      ii. There was a lack of clarity on who would run the academic judiciary committee; it has been clarified that this will be under the purview of the Graduate School
      iii. The question posed: how should the Graduate School organize this committee, and should it be wholly distinct from the GCAC?
      iv. Q: what is the expected frequency of cases?
         1. A: As of right now, quite low. The policy was in place for Spring 2023 and only one case was submitted.
         2. The current policy also allows for negotiation between faculty members and students.
      v. Q: how is this different from the GCAC?
         1. A: It's an added layer, that would come before the GCAC.
         2. Doesn't make sense for the same committee to handle appeals and review the recommendation.
         3. However, appealing to GCAC is only on the basis of new evidence or procedural grounds, so membership need not be wholly distinct
      vi. Q: do these have to be permanent or can they be ad-hoc?
         1. A: they could be ad-hoc. Would then also need GSO representatives
vii. Melissa Jordan & Celia Marshik will prepare a policy for how the committee will be comprised

5. New Business
   a. Nomination and voting for GC chair
      i. *Marcia Simon was nominated and unanimously voted in as chair.*
   b. Nominations for GCAC, Graduate Council Fellowship (GCF), and Graduate School Awards Committee Members
      i. Nominations were held for each, with names redacted here to maintain anonymity
   c. Letter of Intent for new MA in Political Psychology (Political Science Department, full review to state)
      i. Letter of Intent (LoI) is released to SUNY system: other programs have 10 days to announce an intent to comment, and and additional 20 days to submit comments after announcing intent
      ii. If no comments from other SUNY schools, then a full proposal can be prepared
      iii. Suggestions for proposal:
           1. Comment more on demand
           2. Include relevant courses from the Alan Aida Center
           3. Suggest reaching out to SBU's Washington DC liaison to Congress, as she might be able to provide connections and internship possibilities
           4. Clarify the difference and lack of competition with psychology
              a. From Susan Brennan, GPD for Psychology: “I do not expect that there will be competition with Psychology's 1-year MA program, as most of those students are aiming for clinical/counseling/mental health provider careers rather than careers in political psychology or policy.”
              b. Also, CIP codes are for political science, not psychology
      iv. Q: Should core vs. electives be well-delineated?
         1. A: Not necessary for LOI
   v. *Motion to approve. Seconded. Unanimously approved.*
   d. ARH Memo to Update to Comprehensive Exam/Language Requirement (local approval only)
      i. From Brooke Belisle: the program intends to make larger changes that will require SUNY approval. In the meantime, the program would like to make the following changes which do not require SUNY approval:
         1. Allow a two-semester course sequence with high grades to waive the comprehensive exam
         2. Change language on the Graduate Bulletin to indicate acceptance of languages other than French and German for the foreign language requirement
      ii. Q: It seems like the exam was much more broad than the courses. Is this true?
1. A: the comprehensive exam was indeed very broad, though the department would like to focus on contemporary issues more specifically

iii. Comment: the department does not view this as “loosening requirements,” but instead as “modernizing requirements”

iv. Q: do most students take these courses during the first year?

1. A: yes, it’s an advised requirement that many students take. Also has the benefit of creating a cohort

v. More generally than this proposal, language requirements are difficult due to a lack of graduate language training at the University level

vi. Motion to vote on both changes jointly. Seconded. Eight yes, one no, one abstention. The motion passes.

6. Dean’s Report

a. Admissions is now under the Graduate School.

i. Actively working on improving processing speeds

b. New Associate Dean for Strategic Initiatives

i. Elizabeth Boon from the Department of Chemistry

ii. Working with GS on grant-writing for graduate training programs

iii. Will aim to provide an advisor-mentee compact in the near future

c. Separate registration of the HBBMS programs

i. Biological sciences masters has several tracks that are fairly separate, but according to SUNY cannot get the same degree twice

ii. Looking to separate several of these as separate programs

d. David Rubenstein will be working on re-registration of old curriculums (1993 or earlier)

e. Several tracks and certificates were identified as recommended by programs to be shut down

i. University Senate has said GC has the ability to do this

ii. Will raise them as announcements in the Dean’s Report for possible discussion

f. Forthcoming Recommendations for Policy Amendments

i. Dissertation committee composition/rules

1. GPDs are meeting to recommend new changes

ii. Requiring all transcripts from applicants to our graduate programs

1. This is meant to calculate exact GPAs, but is expensive and creates a barrier

2. The Graduate School is reaching out to programs to see if any desire all transcripts

3. If no objections from programs, would like to set the default to only degree-granting transcripts

iii. GRE opt-in policy

1. In 2020, the Graduate School announced it wouldn’t require GRE, and programs had to request its requirement

2. Programs that do require it now mostly do it differentially
3. The Graduate School will pull data on the effects of requiring vs. not requiring the GRE, and revisit this policy in the near future

iv. 1-credit enrollment policy for summer and winter for PhD and Masters students completing the degree starting next year

1. Federal immigration policies require international students to be registered for credit 12 months a year

2. This is only if they’re graduating in that term and would be covered by GTS

3. Should this policy be different for domestic/international students?

4. Suggestion: create a separate course e.g. “GRD 801” which would be selected for finishing students

5. **Should be figured out by January**

v. Discrimination Policy

1. The policy on the Graduate Bulletin was outdated. Changed enumerated examples to “if a graduate student feels that they have been discriminated against on any basis [...]”

2. Also updated to the correct office to report violations to

7. **Motion to adjourn at 3:29pm. Seconded. Passed unanimously.**