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### 1995

September 26, 1995  
No votes relative to policy taken. [Note: tuition and fee waiver policy was discussed, but no motion was made.]

November 28, 1995  
No votes relative to policy taken.

### 1996

February 27, 1996  
No votes relative to policy taken.

April 23, 1996  
No votes relative to policy taken.

Sept 24, 1996  
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 29, 1996  
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 29, 1996 Corrected Minutes  
No votes relative to policy taken.

December 3, 1996  
No votes relative to policy taken.

### 1997

January 28, 1997  
**Proposed Changes in the GFS ByLaws.** Dr. Wallach summarized the major GFS bylaw changes proposed and discussed in the "Executive Summary" that was distributed with the agenda. A motion and second was made to accept the proposed changes and the motion was accepted and attachment was provided. (See attachment) [NOTE: the changes were not documented in the minutes].

February 25, 1997  
**Residency Requirements.** Procedures Committee — Dr. Wallach gave a brief overview of the residency requirement currently in place at MU. She indicated that with courses now being taught on the internet, through cooperative programs, and distance learning, her committee felt the MU residency requirement needed to be redefined.
After discussion, the following motion was passed: “The faculty of each graduate program determines its own residency requirements for doctoral and master's degrees, subject to initial review by the appropriate sector committee of the Graduate Faculty Senate.” The new residency policy will become effective immediately and Dr. Unklesbay will send the Provost a letter indicating the change.

March 25, 1997
No votes relative to policy taken.

April 29, 1997
**Policy for Graduate and Professional Assessment.** Dr. Cook clarified several points included in the handout distributed with the agenda. He clarified that Section 2 of the report included recommendations made by the Committee, not mandates. Under Section 3 in fall 1997 the Sectors will establish schedules for reviewing departmental assessment plans. Section 3, number 4, should read: “The assessment reports will be filed each year with the Provost's Office, which will be responsible for overseeing and recording the annual assessment results and reporting on them to the Graduate Faculty Senate.” A motion and second was made to adopt the policy as it was revised. **The motion was approved.**

September 23, 1997
**English Proficiency.** Old Business. Dr. Placier gave an update on the English Proficiency proposal that was voted on by the GFS Executive Committee last April. She indicated the Committee she had served on had reviewed several policies and had endorsed the proposal prepared by the Program for Excellence in Teaching (PET). A motion and second was made to accept the GFS Executive Committee recommendation to endorse the PET proposal. Discussion followed. A motion was made to support the rights of students at all levels to have effective teaching including the English proficiency of all instructors and further, to support the proposal addressing these concerns put forward by PET. **The motion was seconded and approved. The original motion was voted on and also was approved.**

**Enrollment during Comprehensive Examination Semester** [Note: Motion on enrollment during comprehensive examinations below was later withdrawn.]
New Business. Dr. Lori Franz submitted a proposal related to the enrollment of students during the semester they plan to take their comprehensive examinations. The proposal read as follows: "During the semester in which comprehensive examinations are administered, a Ph.D. student must be enrolled in a minimum of 2 credit hours to be considered a full-time student." Dr. Franz submitted rationale for her proposal. Dr. Cutter indicated the proposal was brought up at a meeting of the advisery [sic] Committee on Graduate Student Support Policy. This Committee felt is was a good idea. A motion and second was made to accept the proposal. Discussion followed. A motion and second was made to table the proposal until more information could be gathered related to what effect this proposal would have on international graduate students and those with financial aid. The motion to table the proposal was voted on and was denied. Dr. Cutter indicated he would withdraw his original motion until an analysis of the effects could be provided by the Graduate School and presented at the next meeting.
October 28, 1997
No votes relative to policy taken.

December 2, 1997
No votes relative to policy taken.

February 24, 1998
No votes relative to policy taken.

January 27, 1998
No votes relative to policy taken.

March 24, 1998
**GSSP. Old Business.** Dr. Sampson distributed the Graduate Student Support Policy (GSSP). It had been distributed at the March Council of Deans meeting and modifications that came from that meeting had been incorporated into the document previously reviewed by the GFS Executive Committee. Discussion followed concerning the policy. After discussing various points within the policy, the Senate believed that the policy contained other issues concerning assessment and enhancement that they believed should be dealt with separately, even though there is a relationship between the GSSP, assessment and enhancement. The Senate recommended that except for Determination of Eligibility for Assistantships that Qualify for Waivers of Tuition everything remaining on Page 2 addresses assessment. The Senate recommended that the advisory committee to be established by Dean of the Graduate School include the GFS Executive Committee.

A motion and second was made to accept the proposed to take the first page of the GSSP, the 4th item on Page 2 of the GSSP (Determination of Eligibility for Assistantships that Qualify for Waivers of Tuition), and the last page of the document and incorporate them into the new Graduate Student Support Policy. The remaining portion of Page 2 would be sent back to the GFS Executive Committee to be reworked to streamline the assessment information. **The motion was approved.**

Discussion followed about the remainder of Page 2. The Committee thought that only items 2, 3 and 5 were important considerations on enhancement and assessment. A motion and second was made to send the remainder of Page 2 to the GFS Executive Committee to redo. **The motion was approved.**

Dr. Cutter stated that the GFS bylaws spell out the composition of the Nominating Committee. The bylaws read: "The Nominating Committee shall consist of the immediate Past President of the Senate, the immediate past Vice President of the Senate (unless that person is the incumbent President of the Senate), the Associate Graduate Dean, and two Senators, who shall have been Standing Committee or Sector Chairs who shall be appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School." Dr. Cutter explained that this year there is no Associate Graduate Dean. **The motion was approved.**
October 27, 1998
No votes relative to policy taken.

April 28, 1998
No votes relative to policy taken.

December 1, 1998
**Assessment.** Dr. Lori Franz, interim associate vice provost, reviewed draft copies of a cover letter, assessment plans, and assessment report forms. The forms included items requested by the Strategic Planning advisory Council. Dr. Cutter gave a summary of the ad hoc committee's report on the Progress Report to the Strategic Planning advisory Council. Discussion followed on how departments/programs could best utilize these forms. A motion and second was made to approve the basic concept of assessment as represented in the forms, with provisions made for review and comments from Directors of Graduate Studies to be submitted by January 20. **The motion was approved.**

1999

January 26, 1999
**Graduate Student Position Titles.** Dr. Cook introduced the proposed graduate student position titles and job descriptions that would quality under the Graduate Student Support Program. Discussion followed with a motion being made to accept the titles and descriptions as presented. An amended motion and second was made to accept the titles and description as presented with the following correction: deleting the sentence under Graduate Research Assistant that read “Depending on specific needs of research projects, it’s possible that a Graduate Research Assistant might actually work on a project 20 - 40 hours per week.” **The amended motion was approved.**

**Assessment.** Dr. Franz reviewed the refinements made to the revised graduate/professional assessment process since the December GFS meeting. The preliminary plan for graduate assessment was approved at that meeting. Drs. Franz and Cook sent the Directors of Graduate Studies and Department Chairs a letter, along with forms, outlining the revised graduate/professional assessment process. Dr. Franz said she had received some email messages suggestion minor editorial changes. Discussion followed on whether the assessment reports should be due on a calendar year or academic year basis. The consensus was to use the academic year with a deadline of no later than July 31. This year departments will have the option of choosing the new assessment forms or the previously approved forms with everyone converting to the new forms next year. After input is received from the Directors of Graduate Studies at their next meeting in February, the revised approved forms will be sent out.

**Clarification for Doctoral Comprehensive Examination Regulation.** Three proposed clarifications were distributed to the Senate for discussion on the needed clarification concerning the doctoral comprehensive examination. After the discussion, a revision was approved. The clarification reads as follows: “For the comprehensive examination to be successfully completed, the doctoral program committee must vote to pass the student on
the entire examination, both written and oral sections, with no more than one dissenting or abstaining vote. A report of this decision, carrying the signatures of all members of the committee, must be sent to the Graduate School and the student no later than two weeks after the comprehensive examination is terminated. If a failure is reported, the committee also must include in the report an outline of the general weaknesses or deficiencies of the student’s work. The student and the committee members are encouraged to work together to identify the steps the student might take to become fully prepared for the next examination. If at any time the student believes that the advice given by the committee is inadequate, the student may send a written request for clarification to the committee. A copy of this request should be sent to the Graduate School as well. The committee must respond to this request in writing within two weeks with a copy to the Graduate School.”

A motion and second was made to accept the clarification as amended. The motion was approved.

February 23, 1999.
No votes relative to policy taken.

March 30, 1999.
Proposal for Nondegree Graduate Student Classification. Dr. Cook discussed the background for the change in classification from Unclassified Graduate Student and Post-Baccalaureate Special classifications to a new Nondegree Graduate Student classification. He provided the following rationale for the change:

1) Simplify terminology and streamline the student data collection for the campus community.
2) Allow all students paying graduate fees to be recognized as graduate students - either degree seeking or non-degree seeking.
3) Enable the word Agrad@ {sic} to appear on the front of students' transcripts and thus facilitate the use of graduate level course work for degree program credit.
4) Update the minimum GPA requirement for all {sic} nondegree seeking graduate students to 3.0, the same as required of degree program graduate students.
5) Maintain the convenience of admission based on a minimum of a bachelor=s degree. Under this new classification 12 hours of graduate level course work taken as a nondegree graduate student may be applied to an MU graduate degree if the student=s {sic} committee approves the transfer.

A motion and second was made to approve the Nondegree Graduate Student Classification replacing the Unclassified Graduate Student and Post-Baccalaureate Special classifications The motion was approved.

April 27, 1999
International Center Policy on Permanent Resident Support Services. Dr. Cook gave background on the policy. He said the Faculty Council had also discussed the policy and would decide on Thursday if they wanted to send a resolution to the Provost about the disadvantage of the policy. A motion was made to send the following proposed resolution to the Provost and Faculty Council: “Whereas the pilot policy on Permanent Residence (PR) Support Services places MU at a distinct disadvantage in the recruitment and hiring
of international faculty members, we the Graduate Faculty Senate and **[Faculty Council]** propose that the policy be changed so that International Scholar and Support Services pursue PR status on behalf of all nonresident aliens who have been offered tenure-track or tenured positions." Dr. Cook said the rationale for this resolution was that by restricting these services to those who qualify for the Outstanding Professor or Researcher category, we are at a disadvantage in hiring and retaining non-resident aliens with respect to our competitor schools (Big 10 and Big 12 universities) who support all regular faculty in the pursuit of PR status. Discussion followed. A new motion was presented for the following resolution: “Whereas the pilot policy on Permanent Residence (PR) Support Services places MU at a distinct disadvantage in the recruitment and hiring of international faculty members, we the Graduate Faculty Senate propose that the policy be changed so that International Scholar and Support Services pursue PR status on behalf of all non-resident aliens who have been offered tenure-track or tenured positions.” The motion was seconded. **The motion was approved as amended.** It was recommended that Dr. Cook add the rationale and a sentence recognizing the value of the services provided to regular faculty by the International Scholars and Student Services Office in the past, and send a letter to that effect to the Provost. Dr. Cook agreed.

**Proposed Changes in the By-laws.** Dr. Cook gave a brief overview of the email discussion about proposing a change in the by-laws to cover situations when the President-elect is not re-elected to the Senate at the end of his/her three-year term. Dr. Cook shared several ideas that were suggested at the Executive Committee meeting earlier in the month which included having the President-Elect serve as a non-voting Senator for the year of the Presidency, appointing the individual as an adjunct senator, or have the Vice-President/President-elect be a senator with a two-year term remaining. Dr. Cook indicated that this year the problem was solved by appointing Dr. Taylor as an adjunct member of the Biological Sciences Sector. Discussion followed with several suggestions that included if the Vice-President/President-elect had to have a 2-year term remaining that would make 1/3 of the Senators not eligible, thus narrowing down the number of candidates. Another suggestion was that the President become a representative of the Senate and a new member take his/her place for the year. They could become a voting member. A motion was made and seconded that the issue be tabled until next year when the Procedures Committee could review the By-laws. **The motion was approved**

September 21, 1999
No votes relative to policy taken.

September 28, 1999 – Special Meeting
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 26, 1999
**GSSP.** Interim Graduate Dean’s Report. Dr. Sampson introduced Karen Gruen, who works with the Graduate Student Support Program (GSSP). Dr. Sampson distributed a copy of the Graduate Student Support Program Handbook. He also gave the Senate a copy of a letter he sent to Provost Deaton showing the general operating funds expended and number of students supported by the Graduate Student Support Program for the last three years. He indicated that the expenditures for the program have declined over the last
three years. A question was asked if a determination could be made as to the amount of fee waiver funding paid for through grants. Dr. Sampson told the Senate that if they would subtract the GSSP fee waivers administered amount from the expenditures amount they could determine the amount of grant-funded support.

Dr. Sampson informed the Senate that three issues needed to be voted on by the Senate related to the GSSP. Ms. Gruen distributed three proposed policies for Senate action.

The first proposed policy dealt with joint programs and the GSSP. Ms. Gruen gave background information on joint programs; i.e., graduate programs and professional programs. A motion and second was made for the following policy: "The GSSP will cover those courses that an otherwise qualified student in a joint program takes that are related to their graduate degree, but not those courses related only to their professional degree. For example, those students in the joint program of Business and Law are allowed to take 6 credit hours of Law courses to fulfill their electives in the joint program. Those specific Law courses will be covered by the GSSP for those students in the joint program." The motion was approved.

The second proposed policy involved courses covered by the GSSP. Background information was given on how the policy would need to be monitored. It was decided that information on courses covered by the GSSP would need to be distributed to current graduate students, faculty and staff, along with new graduate students beginning in the Fall Semester of 2000. Ms. Gruen said that last spring she distributed to departments information on their graduate students who were enrolled in courses not pertaining to their graduate degrees. She said she would be distributing to departments the same information this spring. A motion and second was made for the following policy: "The GSSP will waive those fees, both resident and non-resident, associated with courses that are APPLICABLE AND RELEVANT TO THE STUDENT'S DEGREE PROGRAM." The motion was approved with a correction to be made in the policy to read: "The GSSP will waive those fees, both resident and non-resident, associated with courses that are APPLICABLE AND RELEVANT TO THE STUDENT'S GRADUATE DEGREE.

The third proposed policy involved courses dropped by students and paid for by the GSSP. Ms. Gruen gave background information related to students dropping courses and how it related to payment by the GSSP. For example, a student who withdraws within the 90% refund period would result in the GSSP being charged for 10% of the course. What was being proposed would have the graduate students pay for courses they dropped where the refund was less than 100%. After discussion the following proposal was tabled: "Effective Fall Semester 2000, the GSSP will no longer cover the costs for courses a student has dropped where the refund for the course is less than 100%. It will be up to the responsibility of the student to cover the costs for any course dropped after the first day of classes in a given semester." Senate members requested more information about how many
students were dropping at various times and the costs paid by the GSSP. The Graduate School was asked to provide that information and Ms. Gruen will assist.

November 30, 1999
No votes relative to policy taken.

2000

January 25, 2000
**GRE Writing Assessment Exam.** Academic Affairs. Dr. Unklesbay presented the following proposal regarding the use of the new GRE Writing Assessment Exam: The GRE Writing Assessment Exam is not required of graduate program applicants. Departments may require that graduate applicants submit GRE Writing Assessment scores as part of their application materials for admission. **The amended amendment was seconded and approved.**

**PhD Time Limit.** Dr. Unklesbay presented the last recommendation from the committee with regard to lack of a time limit on the pre-comprehensive exam portion of Ph.D. degree program. The Committee proposed the following: “A Ph.D. student must successfully complete the comprehensive exam within a period of five years beginning with the first semester of enrollment as a Ph.D. student. Individual departments or area programs may stipulate a shorter time period. For an extension of this time limit, the student must petition the Graduate School by submitting a request to the adviser who, in turn, submits a written recommendation to the Graduate School which has been endorsed by the department or area program director of graduate studies.” Discussion followed. The motion was made to amended the proposal to: A motion and second was made to accept the proposal regarding the lack of a time limit on the pre-comprehensive exam portion of the Ph.D. degree program and it reads as follows: “Effective Fall Semester 2000 a Ph.D. student must successfully complete the comprehensive exam within a period of five years beginning with the first semester of enrollment as a Ph.D. student. Individual departments or area programs may stipulate a shorter time period. For an extension of this time limit, the student must petition the Graduate School by submitting a request to the adviser who, in turn, submits a written recommendation to the Graduate School which has been endorsed by the department or area program director of graduate studies.” **The amended amendment was seconded and approved.**

February 22, 2000

**By-laws revisions.**
Dr. Cook summarized the four basic changes to the by-laws. They include the following:

1. There will be five senators from each sector instead of four.
2. There will no longer be adjunct senators.
3. Both the President and Vice-President will be elected at the last meeting of the year.
4. Elected officers and senate members begin their terms at the end of the Winter Semester.
By-laws revisions continued:

The wording of the proposed by-law revisions follows:

Art. 1, Sect. 2, B.
Present version:
Each graduate department and each graduate degree-granting program shall be affiliated with the Graduate Faculty Senate Sector of its choice. Each Sector shall be represented by four senators.

Proposed version:
Each graduate department and each graduate degree-granting program shall be affiliated with the Graduate Faculty Senate Sector of its choice, pending approval by the Graduate Faculty Senate. Each Sector shall be represented by five senators.

Art. 1, Sect. 2, F.
Present version:
The chair of each Standing Committee of the current Senate shall convene a meeting of the newly-appointed members of his/her respective committee by May 1, conduct the election of a chair for the newly-constituted committee, and forward the name of the new chair to the Vice-President for the ensuing year.

Proposed version:
The chair of each Standing Committee of the current Senate shall conduct the election of a chair for the newly-constituted committee by May 1, either by convening a meeting of the newly-appointed members of his/her respective committee or by soliciting nominations and conducting the election by e-mail. The current chair will forward the name of the new chair to the Vice-President for the ensuing year.

Art. 1, Sect. 3, A.
Present version:
[Term of Office]
Shall begin on the first day of the academic year following a Senator's election and shall terminate at the end of the summer following the final academic year of the term for which the Senator was elected.

Proposed version:
[Term of Office]
Shall begin on the first day after the end of the academic semester in which the Senator was elected and shall terminate on the last day of the final semester of the term for which the Senator was elected.
By-laws revisions continued:

Art. 1, Sect. 3, B.
Present version:
The term of office for each newly constituted Senate as a corporate body shall begin on the first day of the academic year and shall continue through the following summer until the beginning of the new academic year.

Proposed version:
The term of office for each newly constituted Senate as a corporate body shall begin on the first day after the end of the academic semester in which the elections took place and shall continue until the last day of the next winter semester.

Art. 1, Sect. 5
Add the following as Sect. A, and renumber the existing Sections appropriately:
In March the Chair of the Procedures Committee will solicit from Senators nominations for President and Vice President of the Graduate Faculty Senate for the ensuing year. He/she will notify all nominees and inquire about willingness to stand for election. The elections will take place at the regular meeting of the Senate in April.

Art. 1, Sect. 5, A. [Note: See correction before vote.]
Present version:
The current Vice-President will automatically assume office as the President for the ensuing year. He or she will take office on the first day of the following academic year.

Proposed version:
The President for the ensuing year will be elected by the Senate at the regular meeting of the Senate in April. The newly-elected President will assume on the first day after the end of the academic semester in which the elections took place.

Art. 1, Sect. 5, B.
Present version:
Vice-President for the ensuing year is to be elected by the Senate at the regular meeting of the Senate in April. The Vice President will take office one week following the election and shall.

Proposed version:
Vice President for the ensuing year is to be elected by the Senate at the regular meeting of the Senate in April. The Vice President will assume office on the first day after the end of the academic semester in which the elections took place and shall.
By-laws revisions continued:

**Art. 1, Sect. 7**  
*Present version:*  
Regular monthly meetings of the Senate shall be routinely scheduled during the academic year by the Vice President of the Senate.

*Proposed version:*  
Regular monthly meetings of the Senate shall be routinely scheduled during the academic year by the President of the Senate.

**Art. 2, Sect. 3, C.**  
*Present version:*  
A request for the designation of a graduate student to serve of the Executive Committee will be made to the Graduate Student Association prior to the first meeting of each academic year.

*Proposed version:*  
A request for the designation of a graduate student to serve of the Executive Committee will be made to the Graduate Student Association at the end of the winter semester.

**Art. 3, Sect. 1**  
*Present version:*  
Each Graduate Faculty Senate Sector shall elect one of its Sector members to the Graduate Student Appeals Committee. Additional members of the Graduate Faculty who are not members of the Senate may be appointed to Standing Committees. Typically, these additional members will be drawn from the Adjunct Senators appointed to sector committees as provided for in Article 4, section 4A, and not two persons from the same department or area shall serve on the same standing committee. Such non-senate members will be encouraged to participate actively in senate meetings but shall have voting privileges only on their respective committees. However, the number of the non-Senate members on these Committees shall be less than the number of Senate members. All Standing Committees except the Membership Committee shall include a representative of the Graduate Senate Association.

*Proposed version:*  
All Standing Committees except the Membership Committee may include a representative of the Graduate Senate Association.
By-laws revisions continued:

Art. 4, Sect. 4, A.

Present version:
Sector Committees shall consist of elected senators from the respective sectors, plus non-members of the Senate appointed by the Executive Committee and given the title Adjunct Senators; however, the number of non-Senate members on these Committees shall be less than the number of Senate members. Following the meeting of the new senate in April, senate members from each sector shall nominate for Adjunct Senate membership on the sector committees three members of each sector for approval by the executive committee. In selecting Adjunct Senators, preference will be given to current or former Directors of Graduate Studies for departments or programs, and typically no two persons from the same department will be elected or appointed to serve on a Sector Committee. Adjunct Senators will be encouraged to participate actively in senate meetings but shall have voting privileges only on their respective committee(s).

Proposed version:
Sector Committees shall consist of elected senators from the respective sectors.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the by-laws revisions as proposed.

Discussion followed with a correction being made to Article 1, Section 5 A to read as follows:

Proposed version: The President for the ensuing year will be elected by the Senate at the regular meeting of the Senate in April. The newly-elected President will assume office on the first day after the end of the academic semester in which the elections took place.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the by-laws revisions as proposed. The motion passed.

Senate Membership. Dr. Cook said that one other by-law change had been suggested, but was not included in this set of amendments. That change would allow no more than one member from each department—or not allow a member of a department already represented on the Senate stand for election. Discussion followed with a motion to add a proposed change in the number of members from each department who could serve on each Sector within a given year. The motion was seconed and approved.

March 21, 2000

Full-time/part time Enrollment. Interim Dean’s Report. Dr. Sampson provided a handout that described full-time/part-time enrollment. He indicated that on page 10 of the University of Missouri Graduate Catalog 1999-2001 doctoral candidacy and continuous enrollment was listed as follows: “Doctoral Candidacy and Continuous Enrollment: Candidacy for a doctoral degree is established by passing the comprehensive examination. Candidacy is maintained by enrolling in 490/491 Research for two semester hours each fall and winter semester and for one semester each summer session up to and
including the term in which the dissertation is defended. Continuous enrollment provides
access to an adviser’s support, doctoral program committee guidance and University
research facilities for completion of the dissertation. Failure to continuously enroll in
490/491 Research until the doctoral degree is awarded terminates candidacy.” On page
62 of the University of Missouri Schedule of Courses, Summer 2000 a part-time students
is classified as: “For an undergraduate student, registering for fewer than 12 hours and
graduate students registering for fewer than 9 hours during the Fall/Winter semester will
be considered as a part-time student. On page 63 of the University of Missouri Schedule
of Courses, Summer 2000, under the heading of “Standards for Academic Progress” “A
full-time graduate student is considered to be making satisfactory progress if he/she 1) is
enrolled in at least nine semester hours of graded course work each semester applicable to
the student’s degree program, and 2) satisfactorily completes 18 semester hours of graded
course work applicable to the student’s degree program in each 12-month period of
enrollment.” According to the instructions for the NSF-NIH Survey of Graduate Students
and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering, Fall 1999 for part-time students the
instructions are as follows: “Report all part-time students in item 6, regardless of their
source of support, by racial/ethnic category (see instructions for item 7). Part-time
students are pursuing an S&E graduate degree but NOT on a full-time schedule. Consider
students part-time according to your own institution’s definition of part-time status.”

A question was raised about how many hours students needed to be enrolled to qualify
for a fee waiver. Students do not have to be enrolled full-time. Another question was
whether there was a charge back for courses not on degree programs. No penalty to
students padding hours. Faculty don’t know they need to,

ByLaws. Procedures. Dr. Cook presented the following change to the by-laws. Article 1.
Section 2, B. currently reads: “Each graduate department and each graduate degree-
granting area program shall be affiliated with the Graduate Faculty Senate Sector of its
choice. Each Sector shall be represented by four senators.” The proposed change reads as
follows:

“Each graduate department and each graduate degree granting area program shall
be affiliated with the Graduate Faculty Senate Sector of its choice. Each Sector
shall be represented by five senators.” A motion was made to approve the change
as presented.

Discussion followed with a proposal to change the wording to Each Sector shall be
represented by five senators each from a different department. A motion was made to
approve the following:

“Each graduate department and each graduate degree-granting area program shall
be affiliated with the Graduate Faculty Senate Sector of its choice. Each Sector
shall be represented by five senators each from a different department.

The revised motion was approved. Since the elections for 2000-2001 are underway, it
was decided that the implementation of senators from different departments would not go
into effect until the 2001-2002 elections.
April 25, 2000

Acceptable courses for the master’s degree and Transfer Credit.

Action Items. The first item discussed was the change in acceptable courses for the master’s degree. Due the increase in graduate courses offered over the Web and via video conferencing, the old regulations concerning credit through correspondence and extension are restrictive and do not address technological advances.

Current regulation for master’s degrees concerning “correspondence credit:”

“Although correspondence or extension course credit earned at any other campus is not accepted by the Graduate School, the school will accept up to eight hours of correspondence courses that are authorized for graduate credit and offered by MU’s faculty through the UM Center for Independent Study at 136 Clark Hall. Courses to be taken for graduate credit must be approved by the graduate dean, and the enrollment form has a place designated for the graduate dean’s signature.”

p. 8 Graduate Catalog.

Proposed change:

“All correspondence, extension, web-delivered, or video course credit earned at MU or other institutions offering graduate degrees must be certified as having been earned for graduate credit as posted on students’ official transcripts. All transfer credit, whatever the source, is limited to eight hours. For courses taken through the UM Center for Distance and Independent Study, requests for graduate credit are approved by the graduate dean and enrollment forms for the Center have a place designated for the graduate dean’s signature to ensure that graduate credit will be noted on transcripts.”

Discussion followed on the proposed change. It was noted that in the Graduate Catalog: transfer credit for master’s degrees is limited to 6 hours. Changing the wording as above would create a conflict of the regulation concerning “transfer credit” as opposed to “correspondence credit.” A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed change. The motion passed.

Proposed change: (under heading of “Transfer of Credit”)

“The committee may recommend that correspondence, extension, web-delivered or video course credit earned at MU may be counted toward the credit hour requirement. Such credit must be certified as having been earned for graduate credit as posted on students’ official transcripts. Correspondence, extension, web-delivered or video courses from institutions other than MU may not be used to meet the total hours required for the doctoral degree.

Discussion followed. A recommendation was made to table the proposal on acceptable courses for doctoral study until next fall.
Graduate Certificates. The last action item related to Graduate Certificates. A "Suggested Policies and Procedures for Graduate Certificates to be Offered at University of Missouri" was presented to the Senate. Discussion followed. The Graduate Certificates will be offered within degree granting programs and will only be issued upon graduation from a degree program. These certificates will not be stand alone programs. A motion and second was made to accept the "Suggested Policies and Procedures for Graduate Certificates to be Offered at University of Missouri" as presented. The motion was approved.

September 19, 2000
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 24, 2000

Public Abstracts. Vice Provost/Dean’s Report. Dr. Ortega addressed the need to add a Public Abstract to the thesis and dissertation requirements. A revised copy of the proposal was distributed. She stressed that a Public Abstract would be used to promote the research being done by MU graduate students to the general public and therefore needed to be written in language the public can understand. The Public Abstract would not exceed 250 words, it would need the signature of the student’s advisor, and it would not be part of the bound thesis/dissertation. Discussion followed with some senators expressing concern about the extra work students would have to write an additional abstract, but a motion to approve the requirement of a public abstract was made and approved. Dr. Ortega was asked to share this new initiative soon with departments so that they would have advance notice. The requirement becomes effective with May 2001 graduates.

Dual Master’s Degree [Note: Background discussion, No vote taken] Next, Dr. Ortega proposed clearer wording for the dual master’s degree option. Current wording in the Graduate Catalog has been interpreted differently by different departments. Background was given on the history of dual master’s. The original dual masters proposal had loosened the requirements that only 8 hours could be used for second master’s degrees. It enabled a student to obtain a dual master’s degree with 15 hours of shared course work, and 15 hours of course work specific to each degree for a total of 45 hours instead of the normal 60 hours for 2 masters degrees. The dual master’s degree are to be completed simultaneously and has the option of sharing a single thesis or independent project. A student would need to be accepted into both degree programs, would have two separate advisors, and two separate committees. Discussion followed with Dr. Saab giving background that dual master’s degrees were proposed as interdisciplinary studies between departments. He distributed a handout that showed the wording of the proposed dual master’s degree option. Ms. Mummert provided information on shared credit for students who recently completed dual master’s degrees. Discussion about the interpretation of the policy followed and focused on the issue of whether or not the same 30-33 hours of course work could be used for two separate degrees. It was recommend that the Academic Affairs Committee review the language of the dual master’s degree option as stated in the Graduate Catalog and propose clearer wording. In order to do this, the Graduate School was asked to provide all the background information it had on record to the members of the Academic Affairs committee so they could address this issue.
Membership to Graduate Faculty. Dr. Thompson gave background on the proposal presented by the Membership Committee at the April 2000 GFS meeting to change the GFS by-laws regarding membership to the graduate faculty it reads as follows:

“That other academic staff members (e.g. non-regular faculty) members with professorial titles and the terminal degree in the employing department be granted Graduate Faculty status without further review. The Membership Committee will review the credentials of those holding non-professorial titles. The credentials must include a cover letter from the academic home of the candidate justifying the granting of Graduate Faculty status.” The motion was approved.

November 28, 2000
No votes relative to policy taken.

2001

January 23, 2001
Guidelines for Good Practices in Graduate Education. Discussion was held on the draft of the Guidelines for Good Practice in Graduate Education. The document had been reviewed, revised, and endorsed by the directors of graduate studies. A motion and second was made to adopt the Guidelines for Good Practice in Graduate Education. The motion was approved and the document will be printed in the upcoming Graduate Catalog. (NOTE: There is a direct link to the document on the web on the Graduate Faculty Senate page at: The address for the GFS page is which is where one goes to select “Faculty Resources” from the Graduate School main page.)

Transfer Credit. Dr. Unklesbay gave an overview of the proposed transfer credit policy for master’s degrees. He said the Academic Affairs Committee had reviewed the current policy in the Graduate Catalog which read:

“A maximum of six hours of graduate credit may be transferred from another university or from another campus of the University of Missouri System....”

The Academic Affairs Committee proposed the following replacement policy:

“A maximum of 20 percent of the number of credit hours required for a student’s degree may be transferred from another university, including another campus of the University of Missouri system....”

Discussion followed. An amended policy was suggested:

“A maximum of 20 percent of the minimum number of the hours required by a department for a student’s degree may be transferred from another university, including another campus of the University of Missouri system....”

A motion was made and seconded to approve the amended transfer policy for master’s degree students. The policy is effective for master’s degree students entering Fall 2001, but it was agreed that current master’s students could use the new policy.
February 27, 2001

**Transfer Credit.** Dr. Ortega recommended that the Senate review and expand the guidelines for student appeals. The guidelines need to provide more assistance than just appealing a dismissal from a degree program. Students are bringing various issues to the Graduate School concerning fair and/or ethical treatment. Transfer credit for non-masters/doctoral students

Dr. Unklesbay presented the recommendation proposed by the Executive Committee on transfer credit for students who do not have a master’s degree prior to entering a doctoral program. The GFS Executive Committee proposed the following: “Transfer credit for PhD students not earning a master’s degree would be limited to a maximum of 12 hours.” Discussion followed. A motion and second was made to approve the GFS Executive Committee proposal as written. **The motion was approved.**

**Dual Master’s Degrees.** Dr. Unklesbay presented a proposal for dual master’s degrees which allows students to complete dual master’s degrees only for those dual master’s degree programs approved by the Senate. The Senate will need to develop proposal guidelines for any departments wanting to offer an approved dual master’s degree. Students currently enrolled in a dual master’s degree program will be grand fathered based on the wording of the Graduate School Catalog at the time of their enrollment. Motion and second to accept proposal on dual degrees. **The motion was approved.**

March 20, 2001

No votes relative to policy taken.

April 24, 2001

No votes relative to policy taken.

September 25, 2001

**Restructuring of the Graduate Faculty Senate.** Two proposals for restructuring of the GFS were discussed.

The first proposal is based on Senate representation coming from the schools/colleges. This is a model most used at peer institutions. The number of Senators might be reduced from 31 to about 16, depending on final representation desired. The proposal also reduces the number of committees from 5 to 2, adds representatives from the Directors of Graduate Studies, and eliminates the Executive Committee.

The second proposal keeps the same number of Senators (31) but reduces the number of committees to 2 with new functions. It was noted that the current makeup of the Senate is not representative because of which senators actually participate. Any changes to the structure of the Senate must have graduate faculty approval.

Discussion followed with a show of hands vote on various proposed models. **A motion was made and seconded to present the first proposal** to the faculty via email to DGS. Following e-mail distribution, two open forums will take place for discussion. The Senate will then arrive at a final proposal to bring to the graduate faculty for a vote.
October 23, 2001

Review of Courses offered by Graduate School. The Preparing Future Faculty Initiative has a one-year curriculum of S/U courses that will be offered under the Graduate School prefix (GS) since they are interdisciplinary courses. Since the Graduate School does not fit under any of the current Sector representation, GFS needs to determine the structure of reviewing courses under the Graduate School prefix. A motion and second was made to accept the proposal the Graduate School courses would be reviewed by a special subcommittee of the Senate. A representative from each Sector will serve on the subcommittee. The motion was amended as follows: The Graduate School courses will be reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee. This motion was seconded and approved.

Dual Masters Guidelines. Ms. Mummert read the proposed guidelines for dual masters degrees. A motion and second was made to approve the guidelines. Discussion followed. After clarification of some wording, the guidelines were approved as amended. A copy is attached.

November 27, 2001

Role of the DGS. The Role of the Director of Graduate Studies was developed by ad hoc committee of Directors of Graduate Studies and brought to the Senate for adoption. Everyone thought is was {sic} a good document. A motion and second was made to approve the document. The Role of the Director of Graduate Studies document was approved for adoption.

Time Limits for Defending Thesis/Dissertations. At the present time there is no limit to the number of times a student could defend his dissertation. Discussion followed. A motion and second was made to recommend a policy similar to the comprehensive exam. This amendment was revised to include thesis and another second was made. The motion carried. The new information will appear in the next Graduate Catalog.

Annual Progress Review of Graduate Students. It was discussed that the annual review of graduate students is related to the program reviews done each year. A motion and second was made to approve the draft document previously distributed. Discussion followed. A motion and second was made to approve the requirement of an annual progress review of all graduate students and that this be a new section of the Graduate Catalog. The motion was approved and the material would be sent to Directors of Graduate Studies, Departmental Chairs and Deans for the information.

2002

January 29, 2002

Clarification of Policies and Procedures for Graduate Certificates. The Senate reviewed the draft provided which included additional clarification and deletions for the policies and procedures concerning graduate certificate programs. The changes included incorporating language for stand alone graduate certificate programs. Discussion followed and changes were suggested. A motion and second was made to approve the document with the amended changes. The motion was approved.
February 27, 2002.

**Policy Regarding Advisors who Retire or Leave MU.** Dr. Drobney introduced the proposed clarification to the Graduate Catalog for masters and doctoral students regarding advisors who retire or leave MU.

Within the regulations for doctoral students under "Selection of an Advisor" the following will be added:

“The student selects an advisor or co-advisors, by mutual consent, from doctoral faculty members who are dissertation supervisors in the department or area program in which the major work is planned. In the event that an advisor retires or leaves MU, he/she may continue to serve as a student’s main advisor unless there is written departmental policy prohibiting such an agreement. If an advisor is unable or unwilling to continue to serve, the department, with the leadership of the director of graduate studies, will assist the student to ensure that a replacement is found.”

Within the regulations for master’s students under ”Selection of an Advisor and Program of Study” the following will be added:

“The student selects a consenting advisor from faculty members of the department or area program in which the major work is planned. Before registering for each semester or session, the student consults the advisor concerning a program of courses. After performing satisfactorily for a minimum of one semester, the student, with the advisor’s assistance, completes a Program of Study form that outlines the plan of study for the student’s graduate program. The form is forwarded through the department or area program director of graduate studies to the Graduate School for approval. In the event that an advisor retires or leaves MU, he/she may continue to serve as a student’s main advisor unless there is written departmental policy prohibiting such an arrangement. If an advisor is unable or unwilling to continue to serve, the department, with the leadership of the director of graduate studies, will assist the student to ensure that a replacement is found.”

A motion and second was made to approve the clarifications identified in italics. **The motion was approved.**

March 19, 2002 AMENDED
No votes relative to policy taken.

April 23, 2002 CORRECTED

**Dismissal and Appeals Policy.** The amended Dismissal and Appeals Policy was presented to the Senate. A motion and second was to approve the amended Policy. Discussion followed. **The motion was approved** to accept the amended Dismissal and Appeals Policy.

**Revision of By-Laws.** Dr. Drobney read the responsibilities that were being added for the Fellowship and Awards Committee. A motion and second was made to approved the amended by-laws. **The motion was approved.**
October 22, 2002

**Statement of Truth Application Language.** A motion was made to approve a statement of truth application languages that read similar to the one used by Penn State. “I hereby affirm that the information provided by me in this application is true and correct, and that there are no omissions or misstatements in my application. I consent to The Pennsylvania State University (the University) taking one or more of the following actions upon discovery, at any time, of any such omission or misstatement of mine in this application: (1) Voiding of my admission to the University; (2) Voiding of my registration with the University; (3) Voiding of credit(s) for course work completed at the University; and (4) Distribution of information relating to such omissions and/or misstatements to other academic institutions, governmental agencies, and other third parties.”

A motion and second was made to include the following statement as part of the graduate application:

“To defer students from submitting fraudulent document and to have a course of action it happens. I hereby affirm that the information provided by me in this application is true and correct, and that there are no material omissions or misstatements in my application. I consent to The University of Missouri (the University) taking one or more of the following actions upon discovery, at any time, of any such omission or misstatement of mine in this application: (1) Voiding of my admission to the University; (2) Voiding of my registration with the University; (3) Voiding of credit(s) for course work completed at the University; and (4) Distribution of information relating to such omissions and/or misstatements to other academic institutions, governmental agencies, and other third parties.”

The motion was approved. The next step will be for the University Legal Counsel to review the statement and then bring it back to the GFS for final review.

**IRB/Animal Care Assurance verification in theses and dissertations.** Dr. Drobney gave background on the need for this verification. He indicated that it would close the door to students who missed the approval of work done on human subjects. Possible ways to check this are: the number of the IRB proposal is listed on the thesis/dissertation, a form for IRB that includes the statement within the thesis/dissertation, or form with the thesis or dissertation and bound with the thesis/dissertation. A motion and second was made to attach the information on IRB with the thesis or dissertation. The motion was approved.

**Verification Procedure.** Discussion followed about how and when to provide the information to students. The information needs to be included in the Graduate Catalog and a form send with the proper paperwork filled out. It could be an additional checkmark on the D1 or M1.

Motion to have all graduate students have verification for IRB/Animal Care Assurance before graduation and that the check off time would be when the D1 (or D3) or M1 is submit with a final check at the time of graduation. The motion was tabled for more discussion.
Graduate Faculty Senate By-laws. Dr. Drobney discussed the changes needed to be made to the By-laws due to the restructuring of the Senate. One bylaw concerns the election and composition of standing committees. The other relates to the duties and responsibilities of the Standing Committees. In particular the new duties that will be assigned to the Academic Affairs Committee. [Note: These are detailed in the minutes, but no action was taken until the November Meeting.]

November 19, 2002

Graduate Faculty Senate By-laws. Dr. Drobney indicated that the following by-laws had been reviewed by the Executive Committee and should now meet the language in the Faculty Handbook. A motion and second was made to approve the additional items under Article 3. Standing Committees

Section 1. The Election and Composition of Standing Committees. The new section is as follows (bold type):

Article 3 Standing Committee
Section 1. The Election and Composition of Standing Committees

   A. New elected officers shall be responsible for identifying a slate of 5 committee members for each of the standing committees to be approved by the GFS by electronic ballot or by a voice vote at the first meeting of the next year. In developing the slate of nominees, attention shall be paid to distributing representatives on the committees among schools and colleges.

   B. If necessary to meet needs for broad disciplinary representation, additional members of the graduate faculty may be appointed to the Fellowships and Awards Committee. Under no circumstance may 2 faculty from the same department or area serve on the same standing committee and the number of nonsenate members shall never exceed the number of senate members on a committee. Nonsenate members serving on a Senate Committee may not vote on policy matters.

The motion was approved to revise the by-laws as described above.

A motion and second was made to add additional language under Section 2 of Article 3. The new section is as follows:

Section 2. Duties and Responsibilities of Standing Committees

   A. The Committee on Academic Affairs shall be responsible for considering questions on policy and for making recommendations to the Senate regarding general Graduate School degree requirements, standards and procedures for admission to the Graduate School, curriculum and course offering, and degree programs. It shall also be responsible for making recommendations to the Senate regarding methods of encouraging scholarly endeavor and faculty development.
New language proposed (bold type):

The Academic Affairs Committee shall be responsible for:

1. Review and approval of proposals for new courses, degree and certificate programs. Substantive changes in existing courses and degree programs shall also require action by the Academic Affairs Committee.

2. Routine curriculum changes such as changes in course titles and course numbers will be approved by the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee.

3. The Academic Affairs Committee shall seek additional evaluation and input regarding course changes and deletions when these changes have the potential to impact degree programs other than those of the proposing unit.

Dr. Drobney indicated that this defined the responsibilities of the Academic Affairs Committee. The motion was approved to add the new language to Section 2 of Article 3.

Approval of New Course Numbering System. A motion and second was made to approve the document Brenda Selman distributed at the October GFS meeting related to course numbering system at the University of Missouri. Discussion followed on what courses are presently professional-level, beginning/mid-level and upper-level graduate courses. The Senate felt that courses renumbered 7000-7999 would be appropriate cross-listed with undergraduate courses renumbered 4000-4999. The crosslisted courses should not be renumbered from 7000-8999 but 8000-8999 should be used as mid-level graduate courses and 9000-9999 as upper-level graduate courses. The Senate also recommended that 8700-8800 be used as masters research and 9700-9800 be doctoral research. A motion and second was made for the following modifications to be made to Ms. Selman’s proposal with the Senate endorsing the renumbering concept in principle with the following changes to be suggested:

1. Current graduate courses numbered 300-399 should be renumbered to 7000-7999 and could be crosslisted with undergraduate courses renumbered to 4000-4999 if appropriate.
2. Middle/upper level 400-499 courses should be renumbered with 8000-8999 for mid-level courses and 9000-9999 for upper-level courses.
3. Masters thesis research should be numbered 8700 and doctoral dissertation research should be 9700.

The motion was approved. Dr. Drobney would give feedback to Ms. Selman regarding the GFS suggestions.

IRB/ACUC verification for theses and dissertations. Dr. Drobney indicated that the verification needed to be included with a student’s thesis or dissertation. A motion and second was made to require verification of IRB/ACUC be included with a thesis or dissertation. The motion was approved. A statement would be added on one of the final forms submitted by students prior to graduation.
January 28, 2003

Course Renumbering. Dr. Drobney provided a handout of the Graduate Level Course Renumbering Scheme. It is as follows:

1. Beginning Level Graduate courses (formerly 300-399) New numbers will be 7000-7999 (Can be cross listed with 4000-4999)
2. Mid-Level Graduate courses (formerly 400-499) New numbers will be 8000-8999
3. Upper-Level Graduate courses (formerly 400-499) New numbers will be 9000-9999
4. Masters Thesis Research New number will be 8090
5. Doctoral Dissertation Research New number will be 9090

Comments:

1. Courses in A above are designed primarily as beginning level graduate courses. They are not for undergraduate credit, but maybe cross listed as 4000-4999.
2. Courses in B, C, D, and E are intended for mid to upper level graduate students and may not be cross listed at the 4000-4999 level for undergraduate credit.

After discussion a motion and second was made to accept the graduate level renumbering as proposed above. The motion was approved.

No Graduate Credit for 200-level Courses. A motion and second was made that graduate credit no longer be allowed for 200-level courses. A survey of selected AAU institutions that allow graduate credit for 200-level or equivalent courses was distributed. Brenda Selman from the Registrar’s Office provided the information. Of the 23 institutions surveyed 3 of the 23 allow graduate credit for 200-level or equivalent. Dr. Ortega provided a handout on 200-level course study by College. It showed the number of students who received a masters or doctoral degree/proportion of students taking 200-level/and average hours/students for the various Colleges on campus for one academic year. It was noted that there were no changes in policy during the year surveyed. The survey did not give the number of students who used these 200-level courses for their degrees. Dr. Ortega indicated that only one student used a 200-level course towards the minimum hours for their degrees. She noted that 200-level courses are mainly prerequisites or for foreign language requirements. She believed the 200-level courses for graduate credit was probably established so international and domestic students could take undergraduate courses to maintain full-time enrollment and allowed educational waivers to pay for 200-level courses. It was noted that with the elimination of 200-level courses for graduate credit it should not increase the time to degree for graduate students. The motion was approved. Dr. Ortega indicated that before the policy is implemented she will check to see that the policy does not course adverse problems with the departmental degree programs.
February 25, 2003

**General Policies for Doctoral Faculty.** A motion and second was made to approve the document prepared on the General Policies for Doctoral Faculty. This document needed to be revised due to the change in the restructuring of the Senate. Discussion and wording changes were suggested. The document was **approved with the tentative changes** to the document. A final copy with the changes made will be redistributed to the Senate for their review.

**AAU Statement on Responsibilities of Universities.** A motion and second was made to endorse the Association of American Universities document “The Responsibilities of Universities at a Time of International Tension and Domestic Protest.” The Chancellor and Provost asked that faculty and student organizations review this document. The **motion was approved** to endorse the document.

**Doctoral Faculty Representation on PhD Committees.** A motion and second was made that at least two members of the Doctoral Faculty be on a doctoral committee. Discussion followed on who beside the Chair should be the second member on the Doctoral Faculty. The **motion was approved**.

An amended motion was made and seconded that the outside member of the committee will be required to have doctoral faculty status. The **motion was approved**. The discussion was then tabled until the next meeting so feedback from departments on effects this would have on their departmental committees.


**Doctoral Faculty Representation on Doctoral Committees.** Dr. Drobney indicated that he had polled the Directors of Graduate Studies regarding the proposed increase in the number of Doctoral Faculty that were required to participate as members of a doctoral committee. He received responses from 22 DGS’s and the majority were {sic} in favor of the new requirement. A motion and second were made that all doctoral committee contain a minimum of two (2) members of the Doctoral Faculty. These two (2) members will include the committee chair and when possible, the external member of the committee. Discussion followed. The **motion was approved**. This requirement will become effective Fall Semester 2003.

**Electronic Submission of Theses through UMJ/Proquest.** Drobney also polled the Directors of Graduate Studies regarding having an electronic submission of theses to the Graduate School instead of the paper copies of the theses. The Library had requested this change due to storage 'space. Of the DGS’s who responded to Dr. Drobney’s poll, the majority supported the change. A motion and second were made to approve a policy requiring the electronic submission of Masters theses and their abstraction through UMI/Proquest. Discussion followed. The format for submission of master’s theses will be the same format students use for doctoral dissertations. Departments can continue to require students to submit a hard copy of the thesis to the department. The **motion was approved** with Fall Semester 2003 as being the date the Graduate School will no longer accept paper copies of thesis.
Addendum to March 2003 Minutes

**GENERAL POLICIES FOR DOCTORAL FACULTY.** The following policies have been approved for adoption by the Graduate Faculty Senate on February 25, 2003 and supersede previous policies enacted on September 16, 1996 and March 9, 1978.

**General Criteria for Doctoral Faculty Membership**

1. The applicant must possess an earned doctorate. Exceptions may be made for cases in which the candidate has demonstrated the equivalent of a doctorate in professional achievement. Petitions for substitution of professional achievement shall require approval by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty Senate.

2. During the past 5 years the applicant shall have published books, articles in refereed journals of national repute or shown other evidence of scholarly activity no less than that established by departmental standards.

3. The applicant's recent participation in directing theses and dissertations in graduate teaching and other scholarly activities shall be important considerations.

**Procedures for Membership in the Doctoral Faculty**

**Initial Membership** - Nominations for initial membership in the doctoral faculty shall be made in accordance with the protocol approved by the Graduate Faculty Senate on 2/27/02 as follows:

- Recommendations for appointment are made by vote of the departmental doctoral faculty.
- These recommendations are subsequently reviewed for conformance to departmental standards for Doctoral faculty by the Vice Provost for Advanced Studies and Dean of the Graduate School.
- This review will result in either a recommendation for approval or postponement until requirements are met.
- In cases where postponement is recommended, the Graduate Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be asked to assist in the review.

**Faculty From Departments Without Doctoral Degree Programs** - Faculty from departments that do not award doctoral degrees can attain Doctoral Faculty status by petitioning for affiliation with a doctoral degree granting program in a related discipline. Doctoral faculty from the affiliated program will provide the nomination for initial membership and serve as the reviewing body for renewal. In the event that affiliation with an appropriate doctoral degree granting department cannot be made, the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty Senate will serve as the nominating and renewal entity.
Transfer of Doctoral Faculty Status - Doctoral faculty members transferring from any department or campus within the University of Missouri system to the University of Missouri- Columbia campus shall retain and be accorded the full status of their current Doctoral faculty appointments.

Renewal of Doctoral Faculty Status

1. The criteria to be utilized for renewal will be the criteria currently in effect for new Doctoral Faculty applicants.

2. All persons seeking reappointment will be required to submit a summary of relevant activities in the format required by the department/degree program.

3. Activity summaries will be reviewed and endorsed or rejected by the doctoral faculty in the candidate's department/degree program.

4. Procedures for renewal:
   a. Notification to departments or programs of faculty to be reviewed by the Graduate School
   b. Completion of the summary of activities by the reviewee.
   c. Review and recommendation by doctoral faculty in the department/degree program
   d. Submission of the recommendation to the Vice Provost for Advanced Studies and Dean of the Graduate School for review. In the event of a negative decision, an appeal or a recommendation that does not appear to be consistent with the stated guidelines for the department/degree program, the applicant's file will be sent to the Executive Committee for review and disposition.
   e. Department Chair and applicants of the decision.

April 29, 2003
No votes relative to policy taken.

August 2003 A copy of the September 2003 minutes are posted.

No votes relative to policy taken.

Leave of Absence Policy. A motion and second was made to accept the proposal to accept the Leave of Absence Policy as written. The motion was approved. The approved policy is listed below:
GFS – Leave of Absence Policy

Students considering Leave of Absence that will result in a break in enrollment of one or more semesters must first contact their graduate advisor and the departmental Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) to inform them of their intent, the reason requesting leave and the expected duration. After approval of the leave at the department level, the Director of Graduate Studies and the student will submit letters to the vice provost for advanced studies and dean of the Graduate School. The DGS letter will verify that department has been informed and that a leave of absence has been approved. The letter from the student will provide an explanation for the request as well as the anticipated departure and return date.

It will be the responsibility of the student to resolve all issues pertaining to their support (eg GRA, GTA, Fellowship or Scholarship) with their advisor or other relevant authority prior to their departure. These issues include the date when support will be terminated and whether or under what conditions the student will be reinstated for support upon their return. Prior to the completion of the Leave of Absence, the student must notify the departmental DGS and the Graduate School so that the reentry process can be initiated. (Note: This paragraph will be incorporated in the policy statement on the Rights and Responsibilities of GRA’s and GTA’s.)

Students on a Leave of Absence may not make significant use of university resources and services or engage in significant consultation with the faculty. Time spent on leave does not automatically extend limits for completion of the graduate degree but can be considered in a request for an extension. Doctoral students who are required to maintain continuous enrollment may petition for an exception to this policy while they are on an approved Leave of Absence.

International Students. International students in F-1 and J-1 non-immigrant status must also obtain authorization from the International Center prior to the initiation of a Leave of Absence and before returning to campus to ensure compliance with current SEVIS regulations and visa restrictions. F-1 and J-1 students approved for a leave of absence may not remain in the United States during the leave period unless authorized by the International Center. For students who must depart the United States, leave periods exceeding 5 months will necessitate updated student immigration documentation for re-entry. All international students considering a leave of absence should meet with an international student advisor to determine the appropriate steps to safeguard their immigration status.

Policy Prohibiting Faculty from Earning a Terminal Degree in the Department in Which They Are Employed [Note: Item Tabled]

Campus Policy on GRE Requirements [Note: Item Tabled]

Rights and Responsibilities Policy [Note: Item Tabled]
November 11, 2003

**Campus Policy Requiring GRE Scores for Admission to Graduate School.** A motion and second was made to leave the requirement of GRE scores for admission to Graduate School to the discretion of the departments. Discussion followed. The **motion was approved**. Dr. Ortega would check with campus officials to determine if there were any policies that would not allow resolution to go into effect.

**Policy Prohibiting Faculty from Earning a Terminal Degree in the Department in Which They Are Employed** [Note: Item Tabled]

2004

January 27, 2004

**Policy Statement on Rights, Privileges, and Responsibilities of Graduate Assistants and Fellowship Recipients.** Dr. Rosser discussed the concerns expressed by the graduate students in their review of the document and asked the Senate's assistance in helping her finalize the document and incorporating those concerns expressed by the graduate students that were appropriate into the final document. Kyle Day, and Deanna Sharpe volunteered to assist Dr. Rosser. Dr. Ortega indicated that they would like to get the document to the Senate approximately one week prior to the next meeting so that everyone could review it prior to the meeting.

February 24, 2004

**Proposal Prohibiting Faculty from Earning Terminal Degree [in same department].** Dr. Howe introduced the current proposal regarding faculty earning terminal degrees at MU.

*The current proposal is:* "An individual who has held, at any time, a regular tenure-track appointment in an MU department is not eligible for a doctoral degree from that department or the area program in which that department participates."

*The new proposed policy is:* "An individual who holds or who at any time has held a faculty appointment in an MU department is not eligible for a graduate degree from that department or from an area or interdisciplinary program in which that department participates without express, written consent of the vice provost for advanced studies and dean of the Graduate School. Approval will be contingent upon submission of a comprehensive set of plans and procedures for dealing with conflicts of interest - apparent and real - and concurrences of the Graduate Faculty Senate Executive Committee."

Discussion followed. The proposal was tabled in order for the Senators to have discussion with the departments they serve and to determine what impact this would be on the Colleges/Schools. Since several Senators had problems converting the document from Word Perfect, it would requested that the document be resent to the Senators as a Word document so they could forward to the departments. (Note: the document was sent out later that afternoon as a Word Document.)
Proposal Regarding Admission of Students Without Financial Aid
Dr. Howe discussed the proposed draft on a policy on graduate students admitted without financial aid. Discussion followed. Dr. Howe indicated that he would work on broadening the policy to include "Truth in Advertising." The proposal was tabled. A suggestion was made to possibly add to the Graduate School website information on housing and living costs in Columbia to assist students in determining the costs associated with accepting admissions to a department/program.

March 30, 2004
Policy Statement on Rights, Privileges, and Responsibilities of Graduate Assistants and Fellowship Recipients. Dr. Rosser highlighted the Policy Statement and thanked everyone who had assisted with the preparation of the document. A motion and second was made to approve the Policy Statement on Rights, Privileges, and Responsibilities of Graduate Assistants and Fellowship Recipients. The motion was approved. Dr. Rosser indicated she would send a final version of the Policy Statement to Ruth to send to the GFS since the document sent with the agenda was a draft copy. [Final version was mailed to GFS on March 31, 2004].

Dismissal/Probation Policy Changes. Dr. Drobney gave an overview on the policies. He indicated that the changes, with one exception, represented only clarification of policies stated in the Graduate Catalog. A question was raised whether the clarified dismissal/probation policies agreed with the language in the Policy Statement on Rights, Privileges, and Responsibilities of Graduate Assistants and Fellowship Recipients. Dr. Drobney indicated that he would review the materials and an electronic ballot would be sent to the Senators for the vote on the dismissal/probation policy in order for this information to be included in the new Graduate Catalog that will be going to printed in late spring.

April 27, 2004
"Truth in Advertising" - Guidelines for Communicating with Graduate Students. Dr. Howe gave the background on the rationale for the guidelines. Discussion followed. Suggested amendments to the document included: adding a last sentence indicating that

- "Academic units are encouraged to provide cost-of-living information to applicants;"
- changing the sentence "Communication in writing is especially encouraged" to "Communication in writing is essential," and
- usage of the word "overpromise."

Discussion also included sending a copy of the document to the International Center for discussion at the International Graduate Student Orientation. A motion and second were made to approve the document with the suggested corrections with the exception of changing the usage of the word "overpromise." The motion was approved. Dr. Howe would forward Ruth a corrected copy and she would forward it to the Senators. [Electronic document was forwarded April 28, 2004.]
**Proposition of term of the Graduate Faculty Senate.** Dr. Drobney gave background on the need to change the end of a Senator's term of service on the Senate from the end of Winter Semester to the beginning of Fall Semester. The rationale for the change is the need for approval of curriculum changes and dispensation of student appeals that may occur over the summer. A motion and second were made for the Executive Committee to remain active through the summer to handle these kinds of issues as necessary. The motion was approved.

September 28, 2004

**Honoring Deceased Graduate Students.** Dr. Wanta introduced a proposal for honoring deceased graduate students. The Undergraduate _______ [sic] has already passed a policy honoring undergraduate students within 30 hours of their undergraduate degree. Dr. Drobney drafted the following policies and procedures to be used in instances in which a graduate student dies prior to being awarded a degree.

1. If a student has completed all degree requirements, the College or School's representative (Dean, Assistant/Associate Dean or Director) will contact the office of provost and the vice provost for advanced studies and dean of the Graduate School to nominate the individual to receive a posthumous degree. The diplomas for the degree that the student was pursuing will be prepared in the same manner as if the student had lived. This diploma may be presented to the family of the deceased in a special ceremony, at commencement or in whatever manner is deemed appropriate.*

2. If the student had not completed degree requirements, but was making satisfactory progress at the time of death, a Dean's Certificate honoring the student can be provided by the appropriate academic unit(s). These certificates may be designed and presented in a manner that is fitting to the circumstances.*

*In some instances, presentation of the degree or certificate to the family members may be made at a Remembrance Ceremony.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the policies and procedures as written. Brief discussion followed with the motion being approved as written.

October 26, 2004

**Size of Doctoral Committees.** Dr. Wanta indicated that Dr. Benoit provided a summary of the responses received from the survey of Directors of Graduate Studies related to Doctoral Committee size. Discussion followed on the reasons for and against the change in size of doctoral committees. It was noted that the original request came from a department that was stretched with having enough faculty to maintain a suitable committees for their doctoral students. It was also believed that more Big 12 institutions were moving towards having doctoral committees with four members.

_A motion was made and seconded to change the current policy from: "The doctoral program committee shall consist of five faculty: at least three from the doctoral program in which the student is pursuing a degree, and an outside member who is a graduate faculty member from a different MU program. At least two of the doctoral committee members must be members of MU's doctoral faculty. The outside member of a doctoral committee cannot be from outside MU._
Persons with specialized expertise may serve on doctoral committees as a fifth or sixth member, with special permission of the vice provost/dean of the Graduate School.

To

"The doctoral program committee shall consist of at least four faculty: at least three from the doctoral program in which the student is pursuing a degree, and an outside member who is a graduate faculty member from a different MU program. At least two of the doctoral committee members must be members of MU's doctoral faculty. The outside member of a doctoral committee cannot be from outside MU. Persons with specialized expertise may serve on doctoral committees as a fifth or sixth member, with special permission of the vice provost/dean of the Graduate School."

Discussion followed that included a timetable for the change to be effective if the motion was approved. It was decided to vote first on the motion and then submit another motion to discuss the timetable. The proposed wording was discussed and editorial changes were suggested.

The motion was approved reading as follows:

“The doctoral program committee shall consist of at least four faculty: at least three from the doctoral program in which the student is pursuing a degree, and an outside member who is a graduate faculty member from a different MU program. At least two of the doctoral committee members must be members of MU's doctoral faculty. The outside member of a doctoral committee cannot be from outside MU. Additional committee members with specialized expertise who do not meet the criteria for the MU graduate faculty or doctoral faculty may serve on a doctoral committee may serve on doctoral committees as a fifth or sixth member, with special permission of the vice provost/dean of the Graduate School."

The Graduate School with the assistance of several GFS members will finalize the wording of the new policy.

Timeline to Implement the Policy. Next discussion followed on the timetable to implement the new policy. After considering various timetables and scenarios related to the change, a motion and second was made to implement the new policy with students entering doctoral programs in the Fall Semester 2005. The motion was approved. The Graduate School indicated that if current students needed to change their doctoral committees from five members to four they would review each review on a one-on-one basis.

This new policy does not preclude departments from continuing to have doctoral committees of more than four members.
November 30, 2004
[Note: No vote taken; this is background information only].

**Policies to Enhance Graduate Mentoring.** Dr. Ortega discussed graduate mentoring. She indicated that she did not think there was a problem with mentoring on campus. She wondered if there were ways that the Senate could suggest that would improve the quality of mentoring. She indicated that the rate of completion for graduate students at MU is above the national rate. It is thought that 2/3 of the students drop out of their graduate programs by the end of the third semester with an additional 1/3 dropping out after they have taken their comprehensive exams. It was decided that two to three Senators would brainstorm the idea and see if they could make suggestions on how to increase the rate of completion of degrees on campus. Nancy West, Lee Wilkins, and John Howe volunteered for the project. Dr. Ortega indicated that Glenda Rice in her office would coordinate a time for the three faculty members to meet.

---

**2005**

January 25, 2005

**Report from Mentoring Subcommittee** Dr. Wilkins discussed the Proposed Resolution draft by the subcommittee on mentoring. The subcommittee's report is attached to these minutes. Dr. Wilkins indicated that there was one correction to be made. It was in the last paragraph and the first sentence should read: "The subcommittee also discussed whether hosting a national conference on graduate student mentoring might be appropriate, either in conjunction with the teaching renewal conference or separate from it." The subcommittee felt that there should be an award for mentoring from the Graduate School. They also thought that maybe a Lecture could be added. They hoped that former awardees, Senators and Kemper awardees would be willing to be part of a panel discussing mentoring. The subcommittee requested that GFS support a request to the Program for Excellence in Teaching to include mentoring on its 2006 campus-wide teaching renewal conference. It was also discussed that maybe the Graduate School should "roll over" the mentoring nominations that it received on a three year basis and this would provide a large pool from which to select the Mentor Awardee. The subcommittee would like to someone check with the Alumni Association to see if there can be funding to assist with the award.

The following resolution was approved: The Graduate Faculty Senate would support the resolution/request that the 2006 campus-wide teaching renewal conference include a substantial number of sessions devoted to graduate teaching and as part of that conference, the GFS would sponsor a campus-wide address, modeled on the Discovery Lecture, that would focus on graduate student mentoring, [sic]

**Addendum to January 2005 Minutes**

**Proposed resolution from Graduate Faculty Senate:*** A subcommittee of the GFS met with Dean Ortega to talk generally about whether the current teaching reward structure on campus appropriately speaks to graduate education and specifically mentoring. After some discussion, the subcommittee agreed that the Kemper Awards tend to be focused at teaching undergraduates or teaching undergraduate in combination with graduate students
(although there have been some exceptions) and that the Senate needs to find other ways to highlight graduate teaching and mentoring.

The subcommittee spent some time discussing a definition of "mentoring", and agreed to define the term broadly to include elements of academic advising, career counseling, research partnering and coaching, and general "wise" advice. Subcommittee members felt that a more restrictive definition did not capture what both students and faculty consider the pluralistic elements of the mentoring relationship. The subcommittee members noted that in some departments, mentoring is a shared responsibility—not one easily assigned to single individuals.

To this end, the subcommittee agreed that it would ask the GFS to support a resolution/request that the 2006 campus-wide teaching renewal conference include a substantial number of sessions devoted to graduate teaching.

As part of that conference, the GFS would be asked to sponsor a campus-wide address, modeled on the Discovery Lecture, that would focus on graduate student mentoring, broadly defined. This address would be coupled with a "Graduate Faculty Mentor" Award.

The subcommittee also discussed whether hosting a national conference on graduate student mentoring might be appropriate, either in conjunction with the teaching renewal conference. The subcommittee agreed that this would be a good idea, and one the campus could use as part of a campaign to boost graduate enrollment. Funding and other issues were discussed briefly, and the subcommittee members decided to take the issue up with the GFS.

February 22, 2005
No votes relative to policy taken.

March 15, 2005
**Travel Waivers.** Bill Payton, the Director of Risk and Insurance Management and Steve Lehmkuhle, Vice President for Academic Affairs at System, joined the meeting to discuss travel waivers for graduate students. Dr. Benoit gave an overview on what precipitated discussion on the possible need for travel waivers for graduate students traveling internationally and in particular to countries that are on the US Dept of State's Watch List. Mr. Payton gave his feelings on travel waivers and indicated that the University's liability claims is $27 million this year up from $9 million in 2002. Dr. Lehmkuhle indicated that the Board has a Policy on Programs Abroad. Discussion followed on who is responsible when students go abroad and what rights are there to fulfill a contract. Mr Payton indicated that there is no blanket policy and each instance needs to be looked at individually. **Since no consensus could be determined** on a policy on travel waivers, it was decided at the present time a statement on safety in laboratories and travel would be include in the Good Practices for Graduate Students document. Drs. Ortega, Benoit and Drobney will work on a draft statement. Mr. Payton did mention that everyone (faculty and staff) have a foreign liability.
Deadline for Graduate Certificates and Minors. Dr. Drobney indicated that at the present time there is no deadline for students who are planning to receive either graduate certificates or graduate minors to submit the paperwork to the Graduate School. The following proposed policy was introduced: "Plans of Study for graduate certificates and designated graduate minors must be submitted to the Graduate School at least one term prior to the conferral of the certificate or minor." A motion and second were made to approve the proposed policy. The motion was approved.

May 5, 2005

Safety Text to be Added to the Good Practices Document. Dr. Benoit gave an overview to the addition on safety to be included in the Good Practices document. The addition proposed is:

CORRESPONDINGLY, FACULTY ADVISERS SHOULD:

Discuss risks that students may encounter while participating in research activities and exert reasonable effort to minimize risks. Faculty advisers are encouraged to consult the following resources for assistance:

•Environmental Health and Safety (radiation safety, chemical safety, biological safety, environmental issues, etc.) http://ehs.missouri.edu/

•Institutional Biosafety Committee (reviews, approves, and oversees all research and teaching activities involving recombinant DNA and biohazardous materials in human, animal, plant, and laboratory (in vitro) use) http://ehs.missouri.edu/bio/committee.html

•International Center (State Department warnings for research travel to international destinations) http://international.missouri.edu/isss/

This would be located in the section under "What Faculty Should Do." This is considered as an alternative option to the waiver the Senate had discussed in an earlier meeting. Only the new bullets will be included in the document.

A motion and second were made to include the proposed text in the Good Practices document. Discussion followed. Questions were asked if something needed to be added for the students. It was decided if advisers discussed this with students that it would meet the need for the student's awareness of the problems. Also suggestions were made to include the State Department and the Center for Disease Control websites included.

A motion was made and seconded that the Good Practices document be revised and include the suggested websites. The motion was approved.
September 27, 2005

**Composition of Graduate Committees.** Dr. Hermsen introduced a discussion item on the composition of graduate committees and the relationship that jointly appointed faculty members have on the committees. Discussion followed on whether jointly appointed faculty members should be considered internal or external committee members. A motion and second was made that faculty members who have joint appointments will be considered as an internal member in each of the departments they have appointment in on a student's committee. The **motion was approved.** The motion does not apply to adjunct faculty. The policy will go into effect with the Winter Semester 2006.

**Blank or Not Recorded Grades.** The next item introduced for discussion was a policy that had been established by Faculty Council related to students who received either a "blank" or "not recorded" (NR) grade. Dr. Hermsen provided background that with the conversion of student records to People Soft the People Soft program must have an entry for each course a student takes. Faculty Council had approved a policy that all NR or Incomplete grades revert to an F after one year. The discussion was tabled until Dr. Drobney could attend the meeting. (He was delayed due to another meeting.) This item was taken up again later in the meeting with Dr. Drobney providing additional background and insight into the Faculty Council and Registrar's rationale and how changing NR grades to F's could affect graduate students. A motion and second was made that all blank grades will be recorded as "NR." This NR designation will remain on the student's transcript until a regular letter grade is submitted by the instructor. If a letter grade is not submitted, the NR can remain on the student's record indefinitely and will not automatically revert to an F. **The motion was approved.**

October 25, 2005

**Jointly Appointed Faculty.** Dr. Drobney indicated that he had done further research on the issue of jointly appointed faculty in the Collected Rules and Regulations for the University of Missouri. He indicated that Chapter 320 of the Collected Rules requires that all jointly appointed faculty members will have a designated Primary Appointment and Primary Department as well as affiliation with one or more involved departments or units. These affiliations affect membership status of jointly appointed faculty on graduate student committees. Based on this information he proposed new wording for handling faculty with more than one departmental home. He proposed the following:

*Committee Chair/Advisor* A faculty member may serve as advisor/committee chair when their Primary Appointment is in the student's home department. When the graduate student's home department is the involved department for a jointly appointed faculty member, they may serve as chair/advisor with the approval of the Director of Graduate Studies from the student's home department.

*Committee Member* A faculty member can only serve as an Internal Member when their Primary Appointment is in the graduate student's home department. When a graduate student's home department is the Involved department for a jointly appointed faculty member, they may serve as either an Internal or External Member of the committee.
Discussion followed. A motion and second was made to reintroduce the approved policy adopted at the last meeting. The motion was approved. A motion and second was made to accept the new wording proposed by Dr. Drobney as written above. **The motion was approved.**

**Graduate Committee Membership for Adjunct Faculty.** Dr. Drobney indicated that there was not a policy pertaining to adjunct faculty on graduate committee. He proposed the following policy:

"Adjunct Faculty may serve as a Committee Chair or Committee Member only in departments in which they are appointed and approved for Graduate or Doctoral Faculty membership as appropriate for the student's degree (Master's or Doctoral). Service on graduate committees outside the department in which they are appointed requires a recommendation by the Director of Graduate Studies from the student's home department and approval by the vice provost for advanced studies and dean of the Graduate School."

Dr. Drobney also provided the Senate with an overview on graduate faculty status for both regular and nonregular faculty. Discussion followed. A motion and second was made to accept the policy proposed by Dr. Drobney. **The motion was approved.**

**Incomplete Grades "I.**" Dr. Drobney indicated that the current wording in the Graduate Catalog (on page 17 under Grades) was not consistent with the current practices for the assignment of "I" or incomplete grades. The current Catalog states that "The student must finish this work (Problems and Research courses exempted) within the calendar year of residence or the "I" will not be removed." He stated that the current practice is to allow the assignment of a letter grade after one year if the grade change is accompanied by a letter justifying the reason for the delay. He proposed the following wording be added to the online Catalog and the next revision of the Graduate Catalog:

"An incomplete grade (I) may be recorded when the student's work is incomplete but otherwise worthy of credit, or when the instructor is unable to assign a grade at the end of the semester. The student must finish this work (Problems and Research courses exempted) within the next calendar year of residence. If the work is completed after one calendar year, the request to change an "I" grade will require an accompanying letter of justification from the instructor. Grades of "I" do not automatically convert to an "F" if not completed."

A motion and second were made to accept the policy as proposed by Dr. Drobney. Discussion followed. Since the policy does not preclude departments from have a more stringent policy a new policy was proposed that incorporates that statement into the catalog. The revised policy proposed was:

"An incomplete grade (I) may be recorded when the student's work is incomplete but otherwise worthy of credit, or when the instructor is unable to assign a grade at the end of the semester. The student must finish this work (Problems and Research courses exempted) within the next calendar year of residence. If the work is not completed after
one calendar year, the request to change an "I" grade will require an accompanying letter of justification from the instructor. Although grades of "I" do not automatically convert to an "F" if not completed, departments or the instructor may establish conditions or regulations pertaining to "I" grades that are more stringent."

A motion and second were made to accept the revised policy proposal. **The motion was approved.**

**Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL).** Dr. Benoit provided the Senate with background on the TOEFL and the different versions of the test, i.e., paper based, computer based and internet based. The internet-based TOEFL will be phased in between September 2005 and May 2006. She provided the Senate with the current policy on the TOEFL which is:

International applicants and non-native English speaking applicants must show evidence of their English language ability by providing the TOEFL report. Applicants who are from native English-speaking countries, including Australia, British Caribbean Islands, Canada (except from French-speaking areas), Ireland, Israel, the United Kingdom, and Kenya are not required to take the TOEFL.

Applicants who have completed at least 24 credit hours of college-level work in the past two years at a school within the United States or another country where English is the native language are not required to submit TOEFL scores.

She noted that some graduate departments require a TOEFL score from all international applicants.

The Graduate School asks applicants to contact the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to have official reports sent directly to the Graduate Admissions Office. However the Admissions Office will work with copies of the test results for admissions purposes. The minimum required score for entrance to the University is 500 paper-based or 173 computer-based. Applicants need to consult with their department of interest for its specific TOEFL policy.

Dr. Benoit recommended the following policy change:

"The minimum required TOEFL score for entrance to the University is 500 paper-based, 173 computer-based, or 61 internet-based. The University also accepts a 5.5 Academic International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score for admission to graduate school. Please consult your department of interest to determine if it requires higher TOEFL or IELTS scores for admission."

She provided the following reasons for the change:

- Internet-based TOEFL is being phased in. A score of 61 is equivalent to the paper-based and computer-based scores the University has currently been using.
IELTS is more widely available in some locations and is a very reputable test of English proficiency.

Departments may set higher TOEFL or IELTS scores for admission.

She proposed that the Senate re-examine the TOEFL policy after one year to see if it needs to be adjusted. Discussion followed with the Senate requesting a one year and two year re-evaluation. A motion and second was made to accept the recommended policy change on the TOEFL as written with a one-year and two-year follow up. **The motion was approved.**

Dr. Benoit next gave an overview on the necessity of having such a policy in place. Discussion followed. It was determined that the issue related to the TOEFL would be re-examined in Fall 2006 and Fall 2007 with data that being accumulated during the current academic year and 2006-2007 on student TOEFL scores and success rate in graduate school to see if there is correlation between TOEFL scores and success rates of students.

November 29, 2005

**Feedback form Faculty on Qualifying and Comprehensive Exams.** Dr. Drobney indicated that the Graduate School had received concerns from graduate students that they did not receive feedback on their qualifying and comprehensive exams. Dr. Benoit drafted the following statement to be added to the Good Practices document:

"The doctoral committee will provide timely feedback and advice about the results of the qualifying and comprehensive exams and identify steps the student can take to become fully prepared for the next appropriate examination."

Discussion followed with a rewording of the draft statement. A motion and second were made to include the following statement in the Good Practices document:

"The doctoral advisor will provide timely feedback and advice about the results of the qualifying and comprehensive exams and for those students who failed they will identify steps the student can take to become better prepared for the next appropriate examination."

The **motion was approved**

**Other policy-related items tabled until January 2006:**

**Deadline for late arrival of international students**

**Transfer of Credit**

**Time Limits on Transfer Credits: PhD**

**Time Limits on Transfer Credit: Master's degrees**
January 24, 2006

**Transfer of Credit Policy.** Dr. Drobney and Dr. Fitzgerald presented the current policy to the Senate.

*The current policy is:*

"The doctoral program committee may recommend credit from a master's or educational specialist degree be transferred toward the total hours required for the doctoral degree. Up to 6 additional hours can also be transferred for graduate course work taken after the master's or educational specialist degree either at MU or another accredited university." They noted that total hours allowed under current policy is 36.

*The proposed policy is:*

"The doctoral committee may recommend up to 30 hours of post-baccalaureate graduate credit from an accredited university be transferred toward the total hours required for the doctoral degree. It is the responsibility of the doctoral committee to determine the appropriateness of course work for transfer credit."

They indicated that the proposed policy differs from the current policy in several ways: a) allows 30 rather than 36 hours; b) allows any post-graduate credit to count, not just that earned in completion of the master's or educational specialist degree, or taken after the MA or EdD. This will also allow courses taken as a nondegree seeking graduate student to count as well as courses taken while pursuing a degree that was not completed.

A motion and second were made to accept the proposed policy on transfer credit as written. Discussion followed which included discussion on using 30 hours past the baccalaureate degree, that 36 hours was too many hours since it was half the necessary hours for a doctoral degree, a suggestion to lower the number of hours to 30, need to emphasize doctoral committee has the final approval for transfer credit for doctoral students. A question was raised whether there was an appeal mechanism for the policy.

*The policy was revised as follows:*

"The doctoral committee may recommend up to 30 hours of post-baccalaureate graduate credit from an accredited university be transferred toward the total hours required for the doctoral degree. It is the responsibility of the doctoral committee to determine the appropriateness of course work for transfer credit. Appeals can be made to the Graduate School."

*The revised policy was approved. "All requests for exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate School. This policy applies to students who begin their enrollment during the Fall Term 2006 and subsequent semesters."*
**Time Limits on Transfer Credits.** Dr. Drobney presented the proposed policy change on time limits on transfer credits. The proposed policy is a simplified policy. The policy change proposed is: "All courses to be applied to the plan of study must be completed within 8 years of filing the plan." A motion and second were made. **The policy was approved.**

**Graduate Certificate Programs.** Dr. Drobney presented background on the current procedures on graduate certificate programs. He indicated that the proposed amendment allows students to receive a stand alone certificate even if they do not complete the degree program. He indicated that departments need to review their current policies to determine if they want stand alone graduate certificate programs or graduate certificate programs attached to the their degree programs.

*The proposed policy is:* (page 1 bold typeface is the addition to the policy)

"Students will be awarded their graduate certificates upon successful completion of a well-defined program of course work. For students whose graduate certificate program is part of a graduate degree program, certificates will be awarded upon successful completion of the degree program. For students participating in a stand-alone certificate, certificates will be awarded at the end of the term in which all the certificate program requirements have been successfully completed. In instances in which a certificate program offers both stand-alone and degree-affiliated certificate options, a student who does not successfully complete their graduate degree may be eligible to receive a certificate if they complete all of the certificate requirements and receive approval by the director of the certificate area study and the vice provost for advanced studies and dean of the Graduate School."

Another addition to the policy was proposed for page 4 (again bold typeface is the addition to the policy).

*The policy proposed is:*

Students participating in a graduate certificate program that requires completion of a graduate degree program will not receive their graduate certificate until they complete their degree program. See p. 1 Under Definitions and Backgrounds for exceptions pertaining to certificate programs that offer both degree-affiliated and stand-alone certificates."

A motion and second were made to approved the amendments as proposed. **The motion was approved.**

February 21, 2006

No votes relative to policy taken.

March 21, 2006

**College of Education Doctorate of Education (EdD) proposal [to alter doctoral committee structure.]** Dr. Hermsen indicated that attached to the agenda was additional information related to the request by the College of Education. She indicated that she, Dr. Wilkins, Dr. Scribner, Dr. Grogan and Dr. Donaldson had met and discussed what the specifics requested by the College of Education were. Background on the policy change included: Since its inception in May 1995 the structure of the EdD doctoral committee...
has differed from the structure of the PhD doctoral committee. The unique structure of
the EdD degree was part to the cooperative agreement approved by the Graduate Faculty
Senate in 1995 and last year the GFS voted to change the size of the doctoral committee
from 5 members to 4 members. At the times, the Senate also affirmed the importance of
the "outside member." The wording of the policy implies all doctoral committees, not just
PhD committees. No exception to the policy was made for the EdD program. The policy
proposed by the COE is a response to the action of the GFS last year. The COE would
like the EdD program to continue to have its own doctoral committee structure that more
closely resembles the committee structure in the founding Cooperative Agreement
documents. Discussion followed with Drs. Grogan and Donaldson joining the group and
providing additional answers to questions posed by the Senate. A motion and second
were made to approve: "At minimum, the committee is comprised of four members. The
chair and one other committee member must have doctoral faculty status. All committee
members must have faculty or adjunct faculty appointments with any department in the
COE as well as graduate faculty status. One member of the committee could be a
practitioner from an educational organizational or community agency who is eligible to
receive adjunct faculty member status within a department in the COE. The committee
chair, in addition to the major responsibility for advisement, will also be responsible for
representing the University and Graduate School in order to ensure that the student's
program is carried out fairly and in accordance with University and Graduate School
Policies. If there is a practitioner member of the committee, he or she must have an
earned doctorate, a leadership position in an educational or community organization, a
minimum of two years of experience in the position or a comparable one, and no direct
supervisory responsibility for the student." The COE EdD Proposal would differentiate
from the PhD Policy as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PhD Policy</th>
<th>EdD Cooperative Agreement Policy</th>
<th>EdD Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum number of Committee members</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum number of members from students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum number of members from different MU Program (&quot;outside&quot; member)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum number of doctoral faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner allowed on committee</td>
<td>Yes, only as 5th member</td>
<td>Yes, only as a 5th member</td>
<td>Yes, only as a 4th member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Grogan and Dr. Donaldson left the meeting and a paper vote was held on the motion. The **motion was approved**.

April 25, 2006

**7000 Level Courses and Graduate Level Credit.** Dr. Benoit presented a proposal on graduate credit for 7000 level courses. The current Graduate School catalog indicates that "No graduate credit is given for courses numbered below 7000. Graduate students taking 7000-level courses should expect to be given additional course requirements in order to warrant graduate credit received for those courses. Courses at 8000/9000 level are primarily for graduate students. 8090/9090 Research (8990/9990 Research for Engineering students) is reserved for master's and doctoral degree students working on a thesis or dissertation." A motion and second was made to revise the wording on graduate level credit for 7000-level courses in the Graduate School Catalog to: "No graduate credit is given for courses numbered below 7000. Graduate students taking 7000-level courses that are cross-leveled with 4000-level courses will be given additional course requirements in order to warrant graduate credit received for those courses. Courses at 8000/9000 level are primarily for graduate students. 8090/9090 Research (8990/9990 Research for Engineering students) is reserved for master's and doctoral degree students working on a thesis or dissertation." This proposal will clarify what graduate students must do to in order to receive graduate credit for cross-level 4000/7000 courses. It was noted that departments need to be better educated to insure that additional course requirements are expected for graduate students who enroll in the 4000/7000 cross-leveled courses. **The motion was approved.**

September 26, 2006

No votes relative to policy taken.

October 24, 2006

**Classified Research Policy** A motion and second were made to approve the draft Policy that Dr. Drobney had prepared that incorporated items from both of Dr. Lombardo's drafts. The purpose of the policy is: 1) To identify research that is prohibited for use in theses and dissertations; 2) To clarify that research which restricted for theses and dissertations may be allowed in another context - Namely, if approved by the advisor and allowed by UM policies.

*Dr. Drobney's revised policy is as follows:*

Restricted Thesis and Dissertation Research Policy vs. Limits on Publication Policy

Students are prohibited from using in their thesis or dissertation, research (data, results or methods) that could restrict subsequent publication or public disclosure of these documents. Examples of restricted information include materials which are classified, proprietary or copyrighted (without permission). It is important to note that these restrictions do not apply to non-thesis or dissertation research that is approved by the student's advisor and allowed by UM policies.
This policy came from two drafts submitted by Dr. Lombardo as follows:

Draft: Limits on Publication Policy

Version 1
Graduate students may participate in research that is approved by their advisor(s) and that is governed by MU policies. Students may be prohibited indefinitely, however, from publishing, including in their thesis or dissertation, information that needs to be kept out of the public domain. Such information may be, for example, classified, proprietary, or belong to another party.

Version 2
Although graduate students may participate in research that is approved by their advisor(s) and that is governed by MU policies, students may be prohibited indefinitely from publishing, including in their thesis or dissertation, information that needs to be kept out of the public domain. Such information may be, for example, classified, proprietary, or belong to another party.

Both Dr. Lombardo and Dr. Drobney gave background on their drafts. Dr. Lombardo indicated that Dr. Drobney's revised draft incorporated all the points he was trying to make in his versions. Dr. Porter presented a third draft on the policy. Her draft version is as follows:

DRAFT: Restrictions on Content in Theses and Dissertations

Purposed: To provide guidance to graduate students and advisers as to content that is prohibited for use in theses and dissertations. Such a policy is needed as one assurance that any work emanating from theses and dissertations will not be subject to restrictions upon publication or public disclosure.

Policy: Restrictions on Content in These and Dissertations

In theses and dissertations graduate students cannot use information that is (a) proprietary; (b) copyrighted (unless permission is sought, obtained, and documented as such in an appendix); or (c) considered classified by the federal government. Advisers, with assistance of program committees, are responsible for ensuring that graduate students comply with the policy. Questions about the nature of any particular information relative to (a), (b), or (c) above should be referred to the Graduate School.
Discussion followed. A motion and second were made to approved a revised policy as follows:

Restrictions on Content of Theses and Dissertations

Purpose:
To provide guidance to graduate students and advisors as to content that is prohibited for use in theses and dissertations. Such a policy is needed as one assurance that any work emanating from theses and dissertations may enter the public domain.

Policy:
Students are prohibited from using in their thesis or dissertation, research (data, results, methods, or other content) that could restrict subsequent publication or public disclosure of these documents. Examples of restricted information include materials which are classified or proprietary. It is important to note that these restrictions do not apply to non-thesis or dissertation research that is approved by the student's advisor and allowed by UM policies. Questions regarding the applicability of this policy to thesis or dissertation content should be referred to the Graduate School.

The motion was approved.

November 28, 2006
A motion and second were made to approve the minutes of the October 24, 2006 Graduate Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was approved with a clarification made with regard to the Policy on Classified Research.

2007

February 27, 2007
No votes relative to policy taken.

March 20, 2007
[FYI for background only. No action taken]

Academic Course Development. Dr. Drobney reviewed the Academic Course Development, Approval, and Life Cycle of courses that was included with the agenda. He indicated that the Coordinating Board of Higher Education and the Curators do not like to approve additional programs without knowing that campuses are eliminating programs. This document, which the System is working on, is a mechanism to reduce the numbers of courses on the books. The document and flow charts identified how courses are approved and how the proposed course lifecycle would work. Dr. Drobney indicated that under the proposal courses that had not been taught within the last two years would go to the Course Depository where they would remain for three years. If the course was not reactivated within the three years, it would be discontinued. Courses that were in the Depository that needed to be reactivated within the three years could be. Discussion focused on the Senate’s concern about the length that courses were not taught before going to the Depository. They felt that some departments offer courses on a three-year cycle rather than a two-year cycle.
April 24, 2007
No votes relative to policy taken.

September 25, 2007
Graduate Faculty and Doctoral Faculty Approval. Dr. Benoit indicated that an inconsistency had been discovered between the GFS Bylaws and the procedures that had been in use for processing graduate faculty applications. She gave an overview of the process described in the Bylaws which involves review of graduate faculty applications by a GFS Membership Committee. There has been no GFS Membership Committee for some time. Based on this inconsistency, she presented two proposals.

- Proposal 1 recreated the GFS Membership Committee and indicated that both graduate faculty and doctoral faculty applications would be reviewed by this committee.
- Proposal 2 provided review for graduate faculty and doctoral faculty from the Graduate School unless postponement was being recommended.

A motion and second was made to accept the proposed the following: to accept Proposal 2, which is 2. All recommendations for appointments to Graduate Faculty Status are made by departmental faculty and are reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School or an appropriate designee for approval or postponement until requirements are met. In cases where postponement may be recommended, the Graduate Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be asked to assist in the review of applications.

The department may appeal if membership is not approved. If the action of the Graduate School is challenged and if an appeal is wished, the disputed file is resubmitted and is considered by the Graduate Faculty Senate for its recommendation. The Dean of the Graduate School receives this recommendation and reviews the case.

C. 3. All recommendations for appointments to Doctoral Faculty Status are made by departmental faculty and are reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School or an appropriate designee for approval or postponement until requirements are met. In cases where postponement may be recommended, the Graduate Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be asked to assist in the review of applications. The documentation for faculty post-tenure review can be used to support applications for doctoral faculty renewal, and units may choose to have the timing of the two processes to coincide.

The department may appeal if membership is not approved. If the action of the Membership Committee is challenged and if an appeal is wished, the disputed file is resubmitted and turned over to the appropriate Sector Committee for its recommendation. The Membership Committee receives this recommendation and reviews the case.

A recommendation was made to replace the Membership Committee to Graduate School. Discussion followed. The policy was revised and a new motion and second were made for the following modified policy.
C.2. All recommendations for appointments to Graduate Faculty Status [sic] are made by departmental faculty and are reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School or an appropriate designee for approval or postponement until requirements are met. In cases where postponement may be recommended, the Graduate Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be consulted by the Graduate Dean.

The department may appeal if membership is not approved. If the decision is appealed, the disputed file is resubmitted and considered by the Graduate Faculty Senate for its recommendation. The Dean of the Graduate School receives this recommendation and reviews the case.

C. 3. All recommendations for appointments to Doctoral Faculty Status are made by departmental faculty and are reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School or an appropriate designee for approval or postponement until requirements are met. In cases where postponement may be recommended, the Graduate Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be consulted by the Graduate Dean.

The department may appeal if membership is not approved. If the decision is appealed, the disputed file is resubmitted and considered by the Graduate Faculty Senate for its recommendation. The Dean of the Graduate School receives this recommendation and reviews the case.

The motion was approved.

Appeal Process. Another policy in the Graduate Catalog that was inconsistent and needed review was the current policy on Appeals. The portion that was reviewed was as follows:

Ad Hoc Appeal Committee

Upon receipt of a written appeal, the vice provost/dean will notify the President of the Graduate Faculty Senate who will appoint an ad hoc Appeal Committee to review the case. Committee membership will consist of five senators who are not members of the academic program involved in the appeal. The charge of the ad hoc Appeal Committee is to consider issues of due process only. The committee is to complete its review of the appeal within 90 days of receiving the student's appeal file.

Communication Through the Vice Provost for Advanced Studies/Graduate Dean

The office of the vice provost/graduate dean will support the work of the Senate's Appeal Committee by providing information to the student, the department/program and members of the Appeal Committee regarding the content, process and regulations/policies pertaining to the appeal. Upon receipt of the appeal file, the Office of the vice provost/graduate dean will duplicate the file and send a copy to all members of the Appeal Committee and to the department/program.
The portions in bold were the problematic statements. The proposed modification for the first statement was: "The appeal must be based upon the program/department's failure to adhere to its or the Graduate School's published rules and regulations.

A sentence was added before the second statement" "The Dean of the Graduate School or a representative will meet with the student to discuss the situation."

Dr. Benoit indicated the proposed statements were being added because students do not know what is happening in the appeal process and if students can meet with Graduate School staff many appeals can be prevented. A motion and second were made to accept the revised Appeal Policy which also included wording clarifications.

The revised policy for the motion reads as follows:
"The progress of each graduate student is evaluated annually by the student's adviser and/or director of graduate studies. The definition of "satisfactory progress" and procedures for its verification may vary among departments/programs. If a department/program has instituted guidelines that differ from those applying generally to graduate students (see below) these guidelines should be made available to students from their entrance into the graduate degree program. If a student is authorized to diverge from progress guidelines established by either the department/program or the Graduate School, this fact should be documented in written form and endorsed by the student's adviser and DGS.

Progress toward Degree

Full-time students (those taking 9 hours or more per semester) should follow the time frames associated with degree programs discussed in the Graduate Catalog under "Master's Degrees" and "Doctoral Degrees." They must submit required forms on time and maintain a grade point average of 3.0 or better. Furthermore, they must successfully undergo their departments' annual review process.

Part-time students should file a timeline for successful degree completion with their department and the Graduate School. This timeline should be endorsed by the Director of Graduate Studies and a prospective adviser by the end of the first calendar year of admission into the department/program. When these timelines conflict with time to degree guidelines laid out in the Graduate Catalog's sections on Master's and Doctoral degrees, they must receive the endorsement of the dean of the Graduate School.

Requests for Extension and Appeals

A "Request for an Extension" and an "Appeal" are distinct processes for dealing with problems related to "satisfactory progress." A "Request for Extension" is the appropriate course of action when a student has failed to meet university-wide satisfactory progress provisions of the Graduate School. The "Appeal Process" should be followed when a department/program has dismissed a student after the required probationary period.
Request for extension

When there has been unsatisfactory progress with respect to meeting Graduate School time to degree limits, the student may file a written request for an extension with the Vice Provost for Advanced Studies and Dean of the Graduate School. The extension must be endorsed by the department/program's Director of Graduate Studies and the student's major adviser and include a timeline for completion of the degree. If an extension is granted by the dean, the student will be given a specified period of time to meet the requirements for progress to degree. Please contact the Graduate School for more information.

Termination

In addition to dismissal for failure to meet the usual examination and grade requirements, departments/programs have the right to place on probation, and after a period of probation, to dismiss any graduate student who is deemed to be making insufficient academic progress or whose work is not of adequate quality as determined by the department/program. The faculty adviser or academic program chair must inform the Graduate School as soon as the student is notified and the probationary period begins. Probation and dismissal may occur at any time during a student's work toward a graduate degree.

When a department/program determines that a student is not making satisfactory progress, the director of graduate studies in the program and/or faculty adviser will recommend a face-to-face meeting between the student and the faculty adviser. If, after this meeting, the department/program and the student can agree on a plan to remedy the situation, the faculty adviser (or DGS) and the student will jointly sign a document enumerating steps to take. If, on the other hand, the department/program and the student disagree on issues of progress, the DGS or Chair may send the student a letter placing the student on probation. Probation must last a minimum of 30 days.

The letter placing a student on probation must include an explicit statement of what must be accomplished and by what date in order for the student to be removed from probation and returned to good standing in the department/program. If the student does not comply with the conditions of probation, a letter (signed by the DGS) will be sent to the student with notification of dismissal from the degree program. Termination letters must inform the student of the right to appeal, first, to the department/program, and second, to the Graduate Faculty Senate. A copy of a termination letter must be sent to the Graduate Dean at the same time it is sent to the student.

Students have the right to appeal dismissal from their degree programs. As long as a student is in an appeal process, the student should maintain enrollment and continue working on degree program requirements. A student's first appeal of dismissal must be made to the department/program. If the student does not appeal, the Graduate School will send the student an official notice of dismissal from the program.
Students should notify their DGS in writing that they are appealing dismissal. A copy of the appeal letter addressed to the DGS should be sent to the Graduate Dean. Departments and programs organize their own appeal processes. If the department/program does not reverse its decision, the DGS will notify the Graduate School that the student has gone through the probationary period and the appeal process and has been dismissed.

The motion was approved. The information will be conveyed to Directors of Graduate Studies.

October 23, 2007
[FYI for background only. No action taken]

Graduate Faculty Workload Policy. Dr. Wilkins indicated that Frank Schmidt could not attend the meeting. She provided additional information that she had learned from him. The workload issue was in response to CBHE. She indicated that within the state of Missouri there are different types of institutions, i.e. Research 1 institutions, four year state universities, junior colleges. The workload issue would give MU credit for working with graduate students. Other universities give credit to faculty for working with undergraduates, graduates and for advising students along with credit for their teaching load. It was important that the type of work done at MU be recognized in a funding formula. A possible suggestion being discussed at Faculty Council was supervising 8 doctoral dissertation would equate to the same as teaching one course. Discussion followed. Dr. Benoit recommended that Pat Morton be invited to the next GFS meeting to provide further information on the funding formula discussion.

Steve Graham, Vice President for Academic Affairs, joined the meeting. He indicated that the workload policy was designed to reflect the diverse types of work that faculty engage in and to provide flexibility in accounting for their activities. The workload policy was initiated in 2002 and was the product of extensive discussions of a committee composed of members of Interfaculty Council, Provosts, and other faculty members.

Based on these discussions, the committee recommended that the average instructional responsibility for all regular faculty members on each campus would be 9 section credits per semester and 180 student credit hours per academic year. Each department was asked to develop a faculty workload standard for teaching, research, service, and administration. Each faculty member would submit an annual report of faculty activities and the department chair would compare these activities to the standard and indicate reasons for waivers that were aligned with the department’s workload standards, consistent with the campus goals, and commensurate with research, individual instruction and advising, administrative duties, service assignments, sabbaticals, faculty development leaves. Dr. Graham indicated that the Regular Faculty Workload Policy is available in the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University under 310.080 and was last revised in 2004 after an Executive Order issued in April 2004. Discussion and questions followed.
November 11, 2007  
**Dual Degrees.** Academic Affairs – Dr. Grogan indicated that one-half of the curriculum changes the Committee had received were approved. The Committee still had the remaining half to complete reviewing. The Committee also had a dual degree proposal in Master of Public Health/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine. The Committee could not find a policy on setting up dual degrees. Questions raised about the dual degree proposal included: if a thesis would be required for the dual degree and how the committee/s would be structured; if students would have access to the dual degrees through both the MPH and DVM degree programs; if students would need to be admitted to both degrees at the beginning of the degree programs or if students could decide to enter the other program at the completion of their first degree; which courses would count toward both degrees; what is the need for a Masters of Public Health degree after a DVM; would working on a dual degree save the students time to completion. Dr. Benoit will draft a letter addressing these concerns.

**Change in Graduate Certificate Policy.** A motion and second was made to change the current policy wording related to graduate certificates *from:*  
“Using Credit from a Certificate  
• If, after completing a graduate certificate program, a student is admitted to a graduate degree program at MU, no more than 12 hours of graduate credit from the certificate program may be used toward the degree program.  
Turning in Your Plan of Study Form  
• For proposals requiring certificate participants to be graduate degree-seeking students, up to six hours of graduate credit used for a student’s graduate degree program may be applied to a graduate certificate.”

*To:*  
“All Situations  
• Up to 12 hours of graduate credit earned for graduate certificates may be applied to degree requirements for a graduate degree upon approval of the degree program.”

The motion was **approved.**

2008

February 5, 2008  
No votes relative to policy taken.

March 18, 2008  
No votes relative to policy taken.

April 22, 2008  
**Review of Proposal on Graduate Certificates.** Dr. Tucker proposed a change in the review process for graduate certificates. She indicated that primary change would be who reviewed the graduate certificates every five years. She proposed that the Graduate School would handle the review instead of the GFS.
The current wording on the policy for review of graduate certificates is: “All graduate certificates will undergo review by the Graduate Faculty Senate after five years. Continuation will be awarded in five-year intervals provided each program shows student interest and financial viability.”

The proposed wording is: “All graduate certificates will undergo review by the Graduate School after five years. Continuation will be awarded in five-year intervals provided each program shows a student interest and financial viability.”

Discussion followed regarding if the certificate was not successful would GFS review, what are the success rates of the certificate, review should look at more than student interest and financial viability. The group suggested adding faculty commitment, courses still being offered, and objectives proposed for the certificate are being met. A motion and second were made to approved the change in review of graduate certificates from the Graduate Faculty Senate to the Graduate School. The motion was approved.

Dr. Tucker would include the following information to departments when their graduate certificates need to be reviewed:

1. Objectives of the graduate certificate are being met
2. Faculty commitment
3. Courses for the graduate certificate are still offered
4. Student interest
5. Financial viability for the graduate certificate.

When concerns and problems arise during the review of the graduate certificates the GFS would be involved.

May 9, 2008
No votes relative to policy taken.

September 2, 2008
No votes relative to policy taken.

September 30, 2008
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 28, 2008 [FYI item – no vote taken]
**Revision of Bylaws** Dr. Tucker indicated that she had reviewed the GFS Bylaws and there were many inconsistencies of them. She indicated that she would put the tracked changes on Blackboard for Senate review. The Executive Committee will work on correcting/reviseing the Bylaws.

December 8, 2008 [FYI item – no vote taken]
**By-Law Revisions** Dr. Tucker indicated that she had gone through the By-Laws and indicated when inconsistencies she found.
January 27, 2009
[FYI item – no vote taken] By-Laws. Dr. Tucker indicated that the current by-laws had been posted to Blackboard. Dr. Wilkins indicated that she would draft new language for the by-laws and then repost to Blackboard for the Senate’s input. Three items to be addressed in the proposed by-laws are: a stronger preamble, how to handle proxy votes, and responsibilities for Senators and Committees.

Discontinued Courses. A motion and second was made to give the Graduate School the authority to approve discontinued courses. The motion was made due to the determination that the GFS did not have the ability to ask a department to continue to offer courses that they could no longer teach. The motion was approved.

February 24, 2009
No votes relative to policy taken

March 31, 2009
No votes relative to policy taken.

April 28, 2009 [FYI item – no vote taken]
Senate Composition. Dr. Cooney presented a proposal that she and Dr. Goodman had prepared. The proposal would have each division having at least one representative on the Senate and the President of the Graduate Student Association would also have one representative. In addition, the proportion of the graduate students that each division contributes to the total number of graduate students would be used to determine the number of representatives each division has. They proposed that each division with fewer than 10% of the total number of graduate students would have one guaranteed representative. Divisions with 10-20% of the total numbers would have 2 representatives and graduate enrollments that make up 20-30% of the total number of graduate students would have 3 representatives. Representative composition would be recalculated every three years based on the average graduate student composition for all divisions during that three year period.

Issues they pointed out included:
- What are the best numbers to be used in estimating how many graduate students are in each division
- Is it important to “over-represent” A & S due to the diversity of its constituents
- Is it important to have separate DGS representation
- What is the upper bound on total size

Discussion followed. Questions included should a five year running average be used to determine size. Should GFS be based on number of graduate students or graduate faculty membership per division? Should the number to an even or odd number of Senators? Concern was raised if the number of Senators increased to above 19. Also mentioned was reviewing graduation data for the last five years to determine Senate composition.
September 8, 2009
No votes relative to policy taken.

September 29, 2009
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 27, 2009 [FYI items – vote taken February 2010]

+/- Grading for Graduate Courses  Dr. Segert presented some general pros and cons for +/- grading. They include for pros: with 3.0 thresholds for graduate students there would be room for differential grading between students; graduate students would have more information on how they stood in their departments; and consensus between undergraduate and graduate similar courses and grading scales. Cons include: graduate students are against because they feel they don’t need grades; +/- may not reduce grade inflations; and implementation of +/- grading for undergraduates was contradictory and misunderstood. Ms. AuBuchon indicated that graduate students are concerned about Masters Degree students being at a competitive disadvantage with +/- if they apply to other schools for the doctorate. She also questioned where +/- lines would be drawn. Discussion followed. It was noted that the Council of Graduate Schools recently had this question on their listserv. A vast number of CGS colleges and universities have +/- grading. Graduate education policies are GFS rights and +/- grading requests come mainly from departments within Arts and Science. Dr. Segert noted that on the undergraduate +/- grading the vote was 56% to 44%. The issue would be explored further next month. He suggested possibly doing a survey of departments that would allow GFS to see how departments feel about the issue.

7000/9000 Level Courses Meeting Concurrently.  Dr. Justice stated he had recently had a conversation with MU Registrar Brenda Selman related to 7000/9000 courses meeting in the same classroom at the same time. He asked the GFS their guidance on how to handle these situations. It was noted that Registration had found 3000/8000 courses had been meeting concurrently and this is not allowed. But these courses were masters/doctoral courses. The GFS wanted Dr. Justice to review each situation on a case-by-case basis but felt that since only graduate students were in these courses there was not the major problems in these situations as are associated with undergraduate/graduate students meeting together. They felt seminars were appropriated since the students were meeting to get an overview of a case/discussion point and then breaking into master’s and doctoral group work.

November 18, 2009
No votes relative to policy taken.

2010

January 16, 2010 [FYI item – vote taken in February 2010]

+/- Grading for Graduate Courses. Dr. Urban went over a recent survey question he posed to Department Chairs and Directors of Graduate Studies. The question was “Would you support a change in Graduate Student grading policies at the University of Missouri to include the option of providing plus/minus grades?” Of the 108 responses he
received 67% were in favor of the change. Dr. Urban presented the findings in the same breakdown as the GFS composition. The largest percentage in favor of the change was from the College of Human Environmental Sciences/Social Work and the largest percentage against the change was from Nursing/Health Professions/Medicine/Veterinary Medicine. Dr. Urban indicated that the survey was only available for two days for voting purposes. Dr. Urban indicated that in order to move the issue forward to the entire Senate for review he would like to have an ad hoc Committee work on the issue. Drs. Friedrichsen and Gilles volunteered to work on the issue. Discussion on the issue included: whether D’s were included in the +/- proposal; GPA for graduate students is cumulative; there are various grading scales for +/- used at institutions across the country and which should be used at MU. The proposal should include if a change were made when it would start and what impact this would be on S/U grading.

February 23, 2010
Ad hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading  Drs. Friedrichsen and Gilles presented a suggested policy change regarding plus/minus grading. The policy would allow graduate student grades in all course counting toward an advanced degree to be reported as A+/-, B+/-, and C+/- . The policy indicated that faculty were not required to use the plus/minus grading scale. The policy noted that the Graduate School considered grades of C+, C, and C- as passing grades but that grades in the C range may not be acceptable for specific programmatic requirements and may result in students being not being able to maintain a 3.0 cumulative average. They requested that the GFS President ask the Directors of Graduate Studies to discuss the proposed policy change with their faculty and give feedback to the GFS President by April 9, 2010. At the GFS meeting in April the GFS would vote on the proposal. If the new grading policy was passed it would go into effect in the fall of 2011. This time frame would allow adequate time for the change in policy to be communicated to faculty and graduate students.

A motion and second were made to ask Dr. Urban to correspond with the DGS about the possibility of adding plus/minus grading to graduate student grades. The motion was approved.

March 23, 2010
Report on Associate Graduate Faculty. Professor Kraxberger indicated that the ad hoc committee looked at different schools prior to making their proposal. The ad hoc committee presented a proposal for a new level of graduate faculty – an affiliate graduate faculty which would allow teaching of graduate-level course at the 7000-8000 level at the University of Missouri, and full graduate faculty status. The affiliate graduate faculty would not be allowed to teach 9000 level graduate courses but could serve on master’s thesis committees. Affiliate graduate faculty would also not be allowed to vote on graduate education issues nor serve on the Graduate Faculty Senate. The rationale for the two level graduate faculty is that current membership on the graduate faculty is an all or nothing proposition, with faculty granted graduate faculty for life independent of their schools or colleges. Many schools have temporary positions that are filled with qualified adjuncts and instructors who are able to teach master’s level students. Those same teachers may not always have as strong of an investment in upholding the standards of
teaching graduate education as tenured faculty or faculty with a long-standing history of teaching and service at the University of Missouri. Suggestions were to add Post Docs as affiliates, to have up to one affiliate on committee, and have affiliates serve as an additional member on a doctoral committee. The proposal needs to include a grandfather clause for those who have graduate faculty status. It was decided to send the proposal to the Directors of Graduate Studies for their feedback prior to the April meeting and include the proposal on the agenda for a vote at the April meeting. Departments will still be allowed to submit adjuncts for full graduate faculty status if they feel they meet the qualifications. Dr. Urban will provide the comments from the Director of Graduate Studies prior to the April meeting. If the proposal is approved at the April meeting, the affiliate graduate faculty status could begin July 1.

A motion and second were made to include the change allowing affiliates serve as an additional member on a doctoral committee. The motion was approved.

April 27, 2010
Proposal to Alter Grading Policy of the Graduate School to allow for Plus/Minus Grades Drs. Friedrichsen and Gilles presented a draft Graduate Grade Policy Proposal. Dr. Urban indicated that no new issues had arisen from the request made to the Directors of Graduate Studies to review the proposal. It was noted the professor must inform students whether he/she will be using +/- or regular (A-F) grading in the syllabus. A motion with amended change was made and seconded. The motion was approved with 9 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstention vote.

Proposal to Establish Affiliate Graduate Faculty Status. Discussion was held on the proposed Affiliate Graduate Faculty Membership proposal. It was indicated that the proposal was not to exclude faculty from being appointed to the graduate faculty but to make it easier for departments to have faculty teach graduate-level courses at the 7000-8000 level. Department would be able to chose whether they wished their faculty to either have graduate faculty or affiliate graduate faculty status. Individuals who were nominated for affiliate graduate faculty could be changed graduate faculty status. Affiliate graduate faculty status would be effective for five years, but may be renewed at the request of the member’s home department. A motion and second were made to approve the proposal. The motion was approved. Dr. Justice would talk to the Provost and Deputy Provost regarding implementation of the new status.

September 28, 2010
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 26, 2010
No votes relative to policy taken.

November 30, 2010
No votes relative to policy taken.
January 25, 2011
[FYI item: The following policies were discussed and assigned to committees:
• Representative of Graduate Faculty Senate on Faculty Council
• Cooperative Graduate Certificate Programs
• Graduate “Topics, Seminars and Problems” courses policy review request by Registrar
• Clarification of the Rule Allowing Research Hours in Certificate Programs
• Remote Participation Policy for Comprehensive Examinations]

February 22, 2011
Graduate “Topics, Seminars and Problems” courses policy review request by Registrar. Dr. Snively indicated the Academic Affairs proposed the following recommendation related to Topics Courses:

1. Topics courses should be decided at the department level. (Discontinue Graduate School and Registrar checking for Topics courses or other subtitles.)
2. New graduate courses (7000 or above) will be monitored by the Graduate School for Graduate Faculty Senate approval or denial
3. Departments should be encouraged to submit permanent course proposals for Topics courses they plan to offer more than four times.

Discussion followed with a motion and second being made to approve the recommendation made by the Academic Affairs related to Topics Courses. The motion was approved.

Cross-level Courses. The second policy the Committee proposed related to Cross-level Courses. The proposal is: In cross leveled courses, at least one assignment should be qualitatively different than those required of undergraduates taking the same course and should be an extra assignment over and above what undergraduates are expected to do. The application form will require an explanation of how the assignment fulfills the departmental criteria for graduate education. A motion and second were made to approve the proposal. The motion was approved.

Discussion followed related to how graduate students find out about Topics and Seminars in other departments. Suggestions were made on how to make this more an easier experience for graduate students.

Clarification of the rule disallowing research hours in certificate programs. Dr. Urban provided a handout on the collaboration that he and Professor Kraxberger prepared with regard to research hours being used in certificate programs. Their proposal is:

“While research experience may be included as a component of graduate certificate programs, research hours applied towards the completion of the thesis or dissertation may not be included. Coursework where students apply skills and practical knowledge such as practicum or laboratory experience may be included
in the coursework required for graduate certificate program. At least 9 hours of
the certificate program must be in non-research hour coursework. “

A motion and second were made to approval the rule. The motion was approved.

Remote Participation Policy for Comprehensive Examinations. Dr. Justice indicated
that this was a frequent topic on listservs. Dr. Justice proposed that departments might
want to allow remote access for committee members when student thesis and dissertation
defenses are set up. Discussion followed and Senators wondered if most universities still
have students come to campus at least once a year to meet with their advisor/committee.
It was noted that both Nursing and Social Work have their online students come to
campus at least once a year. It was decided that feedback should come from Directors of
Graduate Studies on how often off-campus students are required to come on campus and
who is required to be at the comprehensive exam and defense. Other policies that might
need to be reviewed includes how long faculty members have to read thesis/dissertations
and give feedback to students; and do faculty feel pressured by students to provide
feedback in 3 or 4 days. An understanding of the expectations that faculty have to review
thesis/dissertations should be made at the department level.

Shared Services. Dr. Urban sent to the GFS the following statement related to Shared
Services. He indicated that it did not need GFS approval but he would like GFS
endorsement.

No matter what discipline graduate students enter MU to pursue, they all pursue projects that
demand a high level of rigor, organization, and structure. While the definition of “rigor” will
vary across disciplines, I know of no fields where rigor is not demanded. Students all at some
point have to figure out how to conduct research and scholarly activity. Any training that students
receive is either obtained through close interaction with their advisor or mentor, or it is through
some sort of research design/research methodology class they take in their home department. At
best, this means everyone is training graduate students in how to conduct research, organize and
structure it efficiently, and communicate the results to the committee and their own discipline via
publication. This would seem to represent an enormous duplication of efforts on campus. At
worst, some units or individuals do this well and others perform poorly. In my experience, this
problem is especially acute in smaller programs that have less resources and staff to provide
support and workshops for graduate student training or programs that are not as well known
nationally that get a more variable quality of graduate applicants. Instead, the burden for
graduate student preparation is squarely placed on the shoulders of the major advisor. Looking
through some of the information on the Phd Completion project website it seems clear that one of
the most significant obstacles between graduate students and the completion of the degree is a
clear sense of how to structure a research investigation and define the steps to take that will get
them there. Though there is no direct evidence for this, I suspect the shorter “time to degree”
experienced by the physical/biological sciences has as much to do with the fact that research
design expectations are more formulaic and predictable and thereby easier to disseminate to
students than anything else. It is a clearer route through the graduate program that it is or those
in the humanities who have to often figure it out on their own. This begs the question: “what is
the potential transferability of knowledge and skills across disciplines?” For graduate students
entering programs in the humanities/social sciences/physical sciences, are there any common
aspects of their training and professional development that could be centralized in the Graduate
School? I think there would be a great deal of value in providing centralized course offerings (for
example: research design for the humanities, research design for the social sciences, and research design for the physical/biological sciences). One way to reinforce measures of quality and rigor in graduate programs across campus while also perhaps decreasing average “time to degree” would be to expand the Graduate School’s role in organizing a series of courses that units could plug their students into to aid in their professional development as researchers and scholars. The areas I had specifically in mind would be courses outlining how to conduct and organize research: 1) research design - separate courses for the humanities, social sciences and physical sciences; 2) a suite of short-courses or workshops covering specific research methods – depending on demand could be anything from “hermeneutics” to “Bayesian experimental design”; 3) perhaps even some sort of technical writing courses specifically aimed at graduate students intent on publishing their findings. Also beneficial would be some set of courses delineating “best practices” in research and scholarship such as a research ethics course. Perhaps some of these offerings could be organized as courses, perhaps some more focused topics would be best covered in short workshops. One additional appeal for “collaboration” is that workshops could be marketed and attended by graduate students in graduate programs outside MU-Columbia. Have grad students descend on Columbia for workshops or short courses in specific topics such as “Content analysis” or “bifurcation theory” (or anything else...). This would be an excellent way to highlight (and illustrate) the flagship role of this campus and the expertise of our faculty across the state as well as improve graduate education in Missouri. Instruction could be either farmed out to faculty and departments with specific expertise in these areas, or for the more general core courses the Graduate School could perhaps expand on the “faculty fellow” model currently in use and have some of the fellows teach. I’m not sure if this “collaborative model” of graduate education would really be something new or simply a way to maximize efficiency, improve the overall professional preparation of graduate students on the MU campus, and reinforce a common student community outside of disciplinary borders. It may even increase contact and interaction between units and faculty on campus. But I do think it would “raise the floor” for smaller departments across campus allowing them to introduce the sort of rigor that is difficult to attain in situations where only a small number of graduate level courses devoted to methods and professional prep can be taught by an ever-shrinking faculty base. I suspect it might also lower time to degree if the classes were structured correctly and taught well. Not all departments or units would be interested in having their students take such courses, but I suspect a great deal would. As with any other elective course offered on campus, there would be no inherent requirement for students to take them. The Graduate School would need to have programs “buy-in” and endorse the classes for their students. It would also be appropriate in the case of the core interdisciplinary courses such as “research methods” to have an advisory committee or panel of experts help to develop the syllabi or at the very least, a series of topics to emphasize throughout the course of the semester.

A motion was made and second to table the discussion on the statement to a future meeting. The motion [to table] was approved.

March 22, 2011
Shared Services was discussed again. No votes relative to policy taken.

May 10, 2011
[No votes taken. Here is an FYI item]
**Minor in College Teaching.** Dr. Wilkins discussed the proposed change in the Minor in College Teaching language. The asked the GFS to review the current language for the Minor in College Teaching. The current language states: “The Minor in College Teaching (MICT) requires 9 credit hours beyond the major plan of study.” The Minor in
College Teaching Committee is proposing the following change: "The Minor in College Teaching requires a minimum of 9 credit hours. With the permission of the student's academic adviser, director of graduate study, and department, some or all of these hours may be included in the major plan of study." Dr. Wilkins indicated that the Minor consists of three courses and a practicum. There are no online courses used for the Minor and the Committee does not want to include online courses in the requirements. Three courses for the Minor can count towards the 72 hours needed for the PhD at the program’s discretion. The GFS needed the appropriate language for the change and would handle an electronic vote on the proposed change over the summer.

September 27, 2011
[No votes relative to policy taken. FYI item:]
**Classified Research Policy.** Dr. Justice stated that in 2006 GFS passed a policy the Classified Research Policy and the restrictions on content of theses and dissertations. He indicated some departments are now complaining about the policy. He would like the GFS to revisit the Policy and would like it to be put on the GFS agenda for October.

October 25, 2011
No votes relative to policy taken.

November 29, 2011
**Dual Credit for Undergraduate Courses.** Dr. Justice gave background on this issue. He reminded the GFS that last year Soil, Environmental and Atmospheric Sciences proposed a 3 + 2 program to help retain their talented undergraduate students here as graduate students. The GFS did not approve the SEAS 3+2 program. Terrence Grus indicated that there are different models being used for dual credit at other universities. Qualified MU undergraduate students as well as qualified undergraduate students at other institutions in Missouri are eligible to enroll in up to six credit hours of graduate coursework toward the end of the undergraduate program.

*The current Senior Dual Enrollment policy is:*
With the approval of the divisional and graduate deans, eligible seniors may dually enroll as an undergraduate for up to six semester hours of graduate credit. To qualify, seniors must:
• Rank in the upper half of their class
• Have a B average in the most recent 45 semester hours of credit
• Be within 15 hours of completing graduation requirements for the first bachelor’s degree.

*Proposal:*
The Graduate Dean proposes an amendment to this policy, which would allow qualified undergraduate students to enroll in up to 12 hours of graduate coursework and allow enrollment in the courses over the last 30 hours of their undergraduate program. The eligibility requirements would not change; students would still have to rank in the upper half of their class and have a B average in the most recent 45 semester hours of credit.
Updating this policy would:

- Place MU in line with the senior dual enrollment policies of a number of major U.S. research institutions (list provided below) • Generate greater interest and investment by undergraduates in continuing their graduate education, which would aid in the overall retention of MU students for graduate degrees

- Aid in the efficiency of delivering coordinated bachelor’s/master’s programs (3 + 2 programs); e.g. the Fast Track Engineering programs, the BS in Industrial Engineering to MBA program

- Allow MU to create and market more coordinated bachelor’s/master’s programs

Terrence [Grus] provided examples of other Big 12 and SEC universities Senior Dual Enrollment policy. Discussion followed. The GFS thought the proposed policy fits with what departments see undergraduates coming with in AP courses. For the new Senior Dual Enrollment policy, the undergraduate advisor, undergraduate dean, and graduate dean must sign the form and the student is admitted as a Post-Bac {sic} graduate student. A motion and second were made to approve the new policy. The motion was approved. The new policy will be effective Fall Semester 2012. It was noted that individual departmental policies related to how they handle dual enrollment may prevail

Restricted Research and Thesis and Dissertation. In 2006, the Graduate Faculty Senate passed a policy clarifying that proprietary and otherwise restricted research may not be used in master’s theses or doctoral dissertations, although students may in appropriate circumstances be allowed to work on restricted projects. Currently the Graduate School accepts requests for one year embargo to allow students to protect their own intellectual property rights in the thesis or dissertation. There have been several situations on campus in which faculty and students would like restricted research to appear in theses and dissertations. Dr. Justice indicated that this is a topic he wants to address in the white paper. While the campus debates this extremely complex issue, he would like to have the authority to make sure students are not punished and students receive appropriate training. Dr. Justice suggested that the GFS allow the graduate dean to use his/her discretion to continue holds as was previously done under Dr. Benoit, at least for the next 12 months, as the GFS 2006 policy on Restricted Research will be reviewed. A motion and second were made to allow the dean to have twelve months of the discretionary ability to provide continued publication holds on masters theses and doctoral dissertations including restricted research. The motion was approved.

2012

January 24, 2012
No votes relative to policy taken.

February 28, 2012
No votes relative to policy taken.
March 20, 2012
No votes relative to policy taken.

May 1, 2012
No votes relative to policy taken.

September 25, 2012
No votes relative to policy taken.

October 16, 2012

**Dissertation Approval Page.** Ms. Siebenaler indicated that she looked at both AAU and SEC schools with regard to how the dissertation approval page was handled. Options possible for MU include:

- Creation of a new form (M-4/D-5) that would convey the committee’s approval of the written document which would not require original, handwritten signatures; could be submitted electronically through Image Now. Downside was that this might cause confusion among students, faculty, and staff; and would create issues with binding as the form would not look like the traditional approval page.
- Combined defense and written work approval forms to be held by Adviser/Committee Chair until all changes are made satisfactorily which would also not require original, handwritten signature; could also be submitted electronically through ImageNow; would ensure both defense and written document are complete before submission of form, puts much of the responsibility in the hands of the Adviser/Committee Chairperson; could cause issues in instance where students request verification of a successful defense prior to dissertation submission; binding issues would again be a problem; and the new form would again cause confusion.
- Slight changes to the existing approval page in practice and process which would allow the acceptance of faxed or scanned signatures as long as they were legible; could be submitted electronically through ImageNow; be convenient for those traveling; would make the processing of the document more efficient; and would maintain the look of the traditional approval page. Ms. Siebenaler indicated that the majority of the schools she reviewed use the last option.

MU accepts original signature to maintain the integrity of the form. The GFS discussed the options. A motion and second were made to approval option 3 as the option to use. (Option 3 is: Slight changes to the existing approval page in practice and process.)

- Acceptance of faxed or scanned signatures as long as they were legible
- Could be submitted electronically through ImageNow
- Very convenient for those who are traveling whether it be student or faculty member
- Would make the processing of the document more efficient
- Would maintain the look of the traditional approval page.

**The motion was approved.**
November 27, 2012
No votes relative to policy taken.

2013

January 29, 2013
No votes relative to policy taken. [These minutes document the discussion of a GFS Resolution relative the Nuclear Engineering Program and NSEI.]

March 5, 2013
[FYI background items. Votes were taken in April 2013.]

**15 Hour Rule for PhD Students.** The Graduate Catalog states that doctoral students must take 15 hours of 8000-9000 level course work. Issues have recently come up regarding what constitutes the 8000-9000 level courses. A clarification of the language to justify the intent of the courses needs to be proposed so that all can understand the ruling. Ms. Siebenaler and Dean Justice will work on language to present at the next meeting.

**Requirements for students’ satisfactory progress.** The Graduate School and departments have used GPA and other departmental standards to determine a student’s satisfactory progress towards their degree. The federal government has a different standard that includes a 3.0 GPA, completed coursework attempted and departmental standards. Students are getting in trouble when they don’t complete courses or get incomplete grades in their research courses. A change needs to be made to the University guidelines to include courses completed and have student progress checked each semester. Financial Aid runs a report to see if students have completed the percentage of their course work required by the federal government for financial aid. They look at the Summer, Fall and Spring coursework for the determination. The Senators were asked to go back to their departments to see if there would be problems if everyone (student, faculty, Graduate School, and Financial Aid) used the federal government’s standard. It was noted that this affected all graduate students, not just those receiving federal aid.

March 19, 2013

**TOEFL.** [This is a FYI item only for 2014]. Dr. Townsend asked if there could be a re-examination of the TOEFL scores for international students applying to MU. She wondered whether the Senate should re-examine the minimum score in light of how MU ranks with other comparable schools. Dean Justice acknowledged that MU is lower than other AAU schools. **Senators agreed to put the matter on next year’s GFS agenda,** which allows time for the Dean's office to collect data.

**Policy for Graduate Students’ Satisfactory Progress – Changes.** Dr. Erdelez said that the current policy and the revised policy were both included with the agenda.
The current policy is:

At the end of each semester, graduate students with a cumulative GPA below 3.0 are placed on probation. If at the end of the following semester the cumulative GPA is 3.0 or better, the probationary status is removed. A student on probation failing to raise the cumulative GPA to 3.0 may, on the recommendation of the department or area program, be allowed a second probationary semester.

The revised policy is:

At the end of each semester, graduate students with a cumulative GPA below 3.0, or a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better but with fewer than 75% of attempted course completed, are placed on probation. If at the end of the following semester the cumulative GPA is 3.0 or better, and/or if 75% or more of the courses have now been completed, the probationary status is removed. A student on probation failing to raise the cumulative GPA to 3.0 or with fewer than 75% of attempted courses completed may, on the recommendation of the department or area program, be allowed a second probationary semester.

It was noted that some programs will need to alter their grading procedures because some departments do not provide grades for research courses each semester but gives “I” until the research is completed. If approved the new revised policy will be send to Directors of Graduate Studies and student leaders for dissemination to graduate students. There will be a need to keep the Financial Aid and Graduate School percentage of courses completed the same. The timetable for implementation of the new policy would be Fall Semester 2013. A motion and second were made to approve the new revised graduate student satisfactory progress policy. The motion was approved.

Policy for 15 Hour 8000/9000 Level Coursework for PhD Students. This was a topic that was discussed at the last meeting. Dr. Erdelez read the proposed change.

Doctoral students must satisfy the Graduate School’s requirement for a minimum of 15 hours of 8000/8000-level graded coursework to be completed at MU. The 15 hours should consist of coursework that has been approved by the appropriate curricular committee, and excludes any individualized study courses including (but not limited to) problems, readings, and research hours.

Dr. Justice provided background and indicated that usually one or two students had issues with the coursework needed to meet the requirement. A motion and second were made to approve the proposed change in policy for 15 hour 8000/9000 coursework for PhD students. The motion was approved. Dr. Justice indicated the change in policy would be sent to Directors of Graduate Studies.
April 23, 2013
[No votes relative to policy taken, but a FYI item for 2014:]

A question was raised on whether certificates needed to include 8000 level courses. 8000 level courses are not required for certificate approval. This resulted in a question related to the bylaws and if this was included in them. Dr. Erdelez indicated that she would volunteer her memory of this past year and what needed to be reviewed on the bylaws for future revisions. Dr. Justice stated that when Sheryl Tucker was in the Graduate School she had noted that the bylaws needed to be reviewed and possibly revised but that task was not undertaken before she left.

[These minutes also document discussion on NSEI.]

September 17, 2013
Clarification Request from GFS Executive Committee [relative to Senate representation]. As some of the Senators may have remembered the Engineering Senate seat did not have a vote last spring. The Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute indicated that they had been omitted from GFS elections for the past several years. Over the summer more questions came up with regard to the Engineering election. NSEI want their entire faculty including Adjuncts to be able to vote for the Engineering representative. The GFS bylaws are vague on who could vote for Senate representation. The University Faculty bylaws have a clear definition of what is a faculty member.

Dr. Kitchel consulted with the GFS Executive Committee and the group decided that they would accept the faculty bylaws for what the definition of faculty is. The University of Missouri-Columbia faculty shall consist of the president, chancellor, all persons with regular academic appointments, and all full-time, ranked non-tenure track (NTT) faculty with professional designation.

Dr. Kitchel also met with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council with regard to the definition of faculty. He stated to the Senators that even though the Graduate Faculty Senate only answers to the graduate faculty on the campus he agreed to meet as GFS election issues also emerged through the Faculty Affairs Committee of Faculty Council.
• He indicated that the GFS bylaws need to be clarified with regard to who can vote for GFS representation.
• Also, GFS needs to fix election issues by either following the bylaws or if the bylaws have presented challenges historically, to be transparent and change the bylaws matching current practices (e.g. where divisions/departments are electing the representatives).
• He wanted to clarify whether the GFS agreed with graduate education and graduate governance should be representative by the definition of faculty as in the faculty bylaws.

Dr. Rubin asked about Affiliate Graduate Faculty and the status of the various categories. Dr. Hart explained how Affiliate and Adjunct faculty were different in her department and the Adjuncts could vote on departmental matters in the department. It was indicated
that departments may have different rules for Adjuncts with regard to voting in their departments.

A motion and second were made that GFS affirm the GFS Executive Committee’s interpretation of the Faculty Bylaws definition of faculty, as related to graduate education governance. A motion was approved.

[FYI – policy items for discussion in 2014]

**Plan for Reviewing the Bylaws.** Dr. Kitchel provides a draft document on potential areas that needed investigation regarding the Graduate Faculty Senate. He indicated that what was distributed was a very rough draft and discussion would be held on the areas at the next meeting.

**TOEFL** Another possible topic was brought up by Marty Townsend last spring with regard to international students and their speaking and writing issues. Dr. Townsend indicated that the GFS might want to look at the TOEFL score required for admission to Graduate School.