Chairman Chinni called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and introduced the following agenda:

- Approval of the September 9th Minutes (T. Landers)
- Report from subcommittee on Academic Dismissal Appeals
- Other Business

After a review of the September 9th minutes, E. Daffron moved that the minutes be approved as presented. The motion was seconded by L. Chakrin and unanimously approved.

Subcommittee Report: (K. Burke, J. Good, R. Russo, and A. Vasishth)

J. Goode reviewed a draft of the proposed changes to the graduate academic dismissal policy. The subcommittee was tasked with reviewing the existing procedures and recommending ways to expedite a process that has consumed a considerable amount of the Council’s time. The proposal included the creation of a Graduate Council Appeals Subcommittee comprised of the Graduate Program Directors. The Appeals Committee would hear student appeals of dismissal and notify the Graduate Council at the end of each semester.

B. Barnett expressed concern over any change that would remove accountability from the Deans. The Provost holds the Deans accountable for insuring the academic quality of all graduate programs - usurping authority from them is a nonstarter. Leaving the decision exclusively in the hands of the Directors also raises conflict of interest questions. Barnett stated that any proposed changes must be consistent with the undergraduate policy.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the makeup of the appeals subcommittee and the possible participation of the Deans. E. Saiff and E. Daffron endorsed the idea of adding one or two Deans and permitting the Program Director to act as the student’s advocate. The subcommittee membership would rotate with Deans recusing themselves from appeals involving their programs. L. Chakrin emphasized the importance of relying on the judgment of those with the most pertinent knowledge of the situation, typically the Program Director.

M. Dunn asked that the subcommittee be given flexibility to meet face-to-face or remotely in order to accommodate cohorts and programs utilizing a term structure. Student appeals would be held to a strict timeline. However, the timeline must also consider the existing grade submission policies and the appropriateness of notifying faculty of students at risk. The Council discussed the possibility of utilizing CASP but concluded that its size and makeup didn’t provide enough flexibility.

In summarizing the discussions, Chairman Chinni asked the subcommittee to reconvene with E. Daffron and M. Dunn to incorporate the Council’s feedback. He charged the
subcommittee with upholding the academic integrity that currently resides with the Deans, eliminating possible conflict of interests and streamlining the current appeals process. A motion to reconvene was unanimously approved. B. Barnett promised to bring forth any recommendations to the Provost’s Council.

Other Business:
E. Daffron reported that the NJ Presidents’ Counsel had unanimously approved Ramapo College’s mission change along with the MSW program.

The motion to adjourn was made by E. Daffron and seconded by E. Rainforth.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Minutes submitted by Tim Landers