1. Meeting called at 8:30 am
2. Approval of December Minutes – motioned by L. Dornier, seconded S. Hassig, all in favor.
3. Grad Council Meeting Dates for Spring 2020
   o February 12
   o March 11 – will be cancelled, March meeting will be combined with PhD review visit
   o April 15
   o April 22 – Directors of Graduate Studies/Graduate Admissions Officers. Once a semester meeting, reaches a wider population. This is a good opportunity to talk about the challenges we have and think about the next cycle of admissions. This group overlaps substantially with Graduate Council, but they are not the same and GC membership does not imply that members must attend this meeting.
   o May 13
4. Announcements
   a. PhD Reviewer visit: 3/23-3/25
      i. Meetings all day on Tuesday with departments, students, etc
      ii. Graduate Council Meeting with reviewers on 3/25 (Wednesday), may have follow up meetings with departments
      iii. They take about a month to send back a report, though they give an informal preliminary report at the end of their trip
      iv. Sometimes there are common themes and that can translate into other changes on a wider level
      v. These reviews are evaluative rather than formative
      vi. There is one department that we’re struggling to find a reviewer for since it coincides with one of the field’s large conferences
   b. NSF-NIH survey work has begun
      i. Trying to make sure that we’re capturing all of the grad students’ support and all of our postdocs
      ii. Will we have to ask for grant money to cover tuition? OGPS has not heard anything directly. Our thought is that we have not been asking for as much as we could and we should encourage PIs to try to apply for this.
iii. There are limits on how many hours a grad student can work which had limited some of the numbers of grad students that PIs apply for at all
iv. Encouraging PIs to include tuition on grants could be done on a school by school basis. Not all schools provide tuition waivers for instance, so schools could have different policies with this as well
c. Fulbright-Hays Grant application has been posted
   i. Dept of Education fellowship to study abroad and do dissertation research
   ii. Mike is the Fulbright representative for the Fulbright-Hays program
   iii. This is different from Dept of State Fulbright grants and the students from abroad who are Fulbright Scholars
      1. Our tuition level might be too high for Fulbright scholars to budget for (and they may not realize that they would get a tuition waiver)
      2. This is a recruitment issue
d. Website work
   i. University Communications wants to work on streamlining the website and application process
e. Career Workshops – full schedule will be sent around next week
   i. First workshop will be on 1/22 at 12 downtown, on the subject of preparing for conferences as a job seeker
5. Dismissal Policy – second reading and vote
   a. This is a policy not a guideline. Schools/departments can be more strict but cannot be less strict
   b. Why do we have both the B- standard and a GPA standard? Schools would have the ability to make a judgement call if there are more than one B-, but they do have the leeway at that point to dismiss a student.
   c. B- versus C for the SPHTM (SPHTM has used C as the standard for dismissal). We need to clarify which degrees this applies to – professional degrees often have different standards.
d. Timing will always be a challenge
   i. Is this timeline feasible? Would not meeting the timeline also create issues that General Counsel might have to help resolve?
   ii. Timing is an issue for the Fall to Spring semester. Could we put some kind of actual date on it? Could it be the first day of the spring semester?
   iii. Individual schools may have exceptions for timelines within the academic year
   iv. Could we add a line saying: The program chair or committee will notify the student within one week of the potential for dismissal or probation
      1. Italicize the line about exceptions will be made
   v. Could we send the student an email stating that the committee hasn’t met but these are the possible outcomes given the grades given. Lay out the
possible outcomes with the knowledge that the meeting will happen early in the Spring Semester

vi. Proposed edits to the timeline: Keep first paragraph, add a subsection about notification. Notification needs to be made at this point for Fall versus Spring

e. Will PIs pay students if they know they’re being dismissed? Most students that might be dismissed for grades are in early stages and not reliant on PI funding

f. Aren’t students already aware of the policy regarding two B-? Yes, but this should save some time working with the University General Counsel
   i. Students know that with two B- they can be considered for dismissal. Does that count as their warning? No
   ii. With two B-, they don’t have to be dismissed, they could be put on probation, but that is at the department/school’s discretion

g. Faculty and success coaches should be reviewing the dismissal policy with students so that this is not a surprise

h. In new faculty orientation they do learn about what counts as a non-passing grade
   i. Motion to allow a vote by email when edited, motioned by S. Hassig, D. Blake seconded. All in favor (please note in the subject that it is an email vote)

6. Transfer credit policy – second reading and vote
   a. This is a policy, not a guideline
   b. Sealed transcript could be an official transmission by email
   c. Motion to approve – T. Albrecht, second by S. Hassig, all in favor.

7. Motion to adjourn at 9:40 – S. Hassig, seconded by J. Jayawickramarajah