

GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 13, 2014
York Room

Attendees: Kathy Burke, Lew Chakrin, Brian Chinni (Chairman), Eric Daffron, Michele Dunn, Julie Good, Tim Landers (Secretary), Emma Rainforth, Ruma Sen (ARC Representative), Steve Rice, Chris Romano, Sam Rosenberg, Rich Russo, Eddie Saiff.

Chairman Chinni opened the meeting at 10:01 a.m. and introduced the following agenda:

- Approval of the 11/13 Minutes (Tim)
- Update on Academic Dismissal Policy Evaluation (ADPE Sub-Committee)
- Other Business

After a review of the November 14th minutes, E. Saiff moved that they be approved as amended. The motion was seconded by E. Daffron and unanimously approved.

Sub-Committee Recommendation:

E. Daffron presented the latest recommendation from the ADPE Sub-Committee exploring changes to the dismissal appeal policy. The recommendation calls for the creation of a Graduate Appeals Committee (GAC), which is to be comprised of three Program Directors, a school Dean, the Registrar (non-voting member), and the Chair of the Graduate Council who Chairs the GAC and votes only in the case of a tie. Members will be appointed for one year beginning September 1st and must be available to meet physically or virtually on an as needed basis. In cases where a Program Director or Dean is reviewing an appeal by one of his/her own students, the Chairman will select an alternate. C. Romano recommended that alternates hold the same title as the person they are replacing.

E. Daffron noted that the five-day deadline for undergraduate appeals does not accommodate graduate programs operating on an accelerated basis, some with only a week between terms. He recommended that student appeals be received within three calendar days of the dismissal notice. Program Directors are responsible for notifying students in writing immediately after grades are posted. M. Dunn asked that the Registrar's office be added along with the Dean and Council Chairman on any dismissal notices.

A discussion followed regarding the requirement that a student must be in good academic standing in order to enroll in thesis or final project course. The requirement essentially reduces the number of semesters, terms and courses available to students needing to restore their GPA to 3.0. L. Chakrin noted that students enrolled in a cohort model might have to wait a full year to join another cohort in order to complete the last term. The policy is especially restrictive for students enrolled in programs that do not offer an independent study option. As long as the student is fully aware of the circumstances and a mathematical possibility exists, students should not be denied the opportunity to enroll in the last semester/term.

As an alternative, M. Dunn suggested that course descriptions be amended to state that enrollment in a final thesis class is not automatic and requires the approval of the Program Director. C. Romano recommended that language be added under "Satisfactory Progress"

emphasizing that each program offers a finite number of courses that must be satisfactorily completed within the five-year period.

E. Daffron suggested that the wording for enrollment in a thesis or final project is misplaced as part of Academic Standing and should be included under Satisfactory Progress. He recommended that we remove the language from the sub-committee's proposal and leave any discussion of possible changes to a later review of Satisfactory Progress.

After reviewing the language under Academic Standing, M Dunn recommended that we delete "subject to" in the second bullet under #3 and simply state "...the student will be dismissed from the program with the right to appeal." E. Rainforth recommended that the first sentence under items #2 and #3 be rewritten as follows: "At the completion of the next term or semester of enrollment, all student GPAs are evaluated again." The bullets under #2 should begin with "If a probationary student..." The bullets under #3 should begin with "If a student on continued probation..."

Given the accelerated timetable and the fact that working adults may not check their Ramapo emails with the same frequency as undergraduates, E. Saiff recommended that we clearly define the means and timing of all communication between the student, the Program Director, Dean and Council Chairman, e.g., notification will take place via a student's Ramapo email and appeals must be received by midnight on the third calendar day following notification.

E. Daffron moved to approval the sub-committee's recommendation with the following amendments:

- Appeals must be made within three days of the dismissal notification
- Specify the timeframe and mode of communication
- Include the Registrar on all student correspondence
- Require alternate GAC members to hold an equivalent title
- Include wordsmithing from M. Dunn and E. Rainforth

The motion was seconded by J. Good and unanimously approved. The new policy will go into effect for the 2015/16 AY.

C. Romano moved to extend the discussion of the enrollment policy for final thesis and projects as part of a separate review of Satisfactory Progress. The motion was seconded by E. Rainforth and unanimously approved.

Other Business:

M. Dunn said she is still missing student files and reminded Deans and Directors that all student files must be held by the Registrar's office.

C. Romano announced that he and the Provost would soon be scheduling meetings with the Deans and Program Directors to review their four-year budgets.

The meeting adjourned at 10:53 a.m.