

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA. GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL STUDENT COUNCIL

General Council Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 22, 2008

Meeting called to order at 6:03 pm by Bridget Barker

Present: Stephen Bieda, Bridget Barker, Emily Connally, Jessica Gerlach, Jed Laver, Jill Burris, Stephanie Levitt, Lauren Sekora, Robert Jacobi, Sanket Unhale, Erica Cirillo-McCarthy, David Lopez-Negrete, David Talenfeld, Helena Morrison, James Johnson, A Quadir Khan, Kunal Ramani, Tim Chambers, Roeland Hancock, Tucker Peck, Jim Collins, Sandra Nameth, Mabel Crescioni, Sarah K. Smith

Proxies: Boris Glebov, Alison Betts, Brittany Perkins, Tiffany Goforth, Chizanya Mpinja

I. Call to Audience - none

II. Guests -

- a. **Jason Casares, Assistant Dean of Students:** Taking questions on the proposed changes to the Code of Academic Integrity. Dr. Casares explained the desired changes. A specification was added to allow faculty only 15 academic days, instead of up to several years, to report a suspected violation and notify the student. Students have already raised concerns about the sanctions allowing revoking of degree. Revocation has always been an option, but the code change proposed explicitly lists the possibility to make students more aware. Further, because in the past students have not exercised the right to appeal, an appeal is now automatic in some cases. Finally, changes were made to general provisions: previously nothing specified about pre-session, summer session, winter session hearings, so in theory punishment was not an option outside of the traditional academic year. The dean's office is working with several groups on campus to perfect this document with the goal to have it passed by ABOR by the end of this semester.

Q: Emily Connally: What is the difference between a reasonable amount of time a student can expect for notice before a hearing and 15 academic days given to faculty to report suspected offense? Perhaps we could define the minimum "reasonable" amount of time a student has notice before a hearing date.

A: We just haven't specified what the number of hours or days should be. We can specify.

Q: David Talenfeld: How often do violations occur, how often are they expulsions?

A: Expulsions are in the extreme minority. I have those numbers and can present them another time to this group. Typically students appeal quickly if that is the punishment. We're creating an academic integrity course to educate students about academic integrity and are working with an academic integrity council to smooth out those details. Our next meeting is next week. We would love to have anyone willing to show up give feedback.

Q: David Talenfeld: In terms of the process, the student is notified, goes to the meeting, and is the decision laid down then?

A: Our preference is that the decision happens that day, however some faculty members prefer to have a day to think or consult. Typically students find out in a day. Authority resides with the faculty member.

Q: David Talenfeld: My concern is that if students can earn expulsion, the decision should be up to someone who is not just the faculty member. What about students on the hearing board?

A: Such a situation is why we have the appeal process. We have a hearing officer listen to the faculty member and the student and then deciding.

Q: Jim Collins: How would you feel about adding something to formalize the process of informing the student the hearing is taking place, citing the code, and making sure the student knows what is happening. We want to make sure the notice is more formal than just a notice of a meeting.

A: That makes sense to let the student know ahead of the meeting time.

Q: Jim Collins: Under details regarding prohibited conduct, what would be an ethical requirement to gain unfair advantage in lab work? Where would I turn as a student to find guidelines so I know what is ethical and what is not? We should have this unambiguously defined for students.

A: Let me get back to you on that.

Q: Roeland Hancock: I would assume this ethical violations clause is referring to work with live animals and humans. There should be something about professional standards of ethics outside of laboratory safety guidelines.

A: Yes we can add that.

Q: Jim Collins: Is there a right to have another person present for situations other than the hearing board? If the department calls me in, do I have a right to attorney there? Would it be appropriate to add a clause indicating that a student has a right to advisor at any point.

A: Absolutely. You have the right to any advisor at any point. We can definitely add that, it is a good idea.

Q: Erica Cirillo-McCarthy: Regarding bringing in an advisor at any point. I see that as problematic if a student brings a parent in. I cannot speak to a parent about the grades without permission.

A: Fantastic point. To be clear. An advisor cannot talk for or try to represent the student. If you have a parent, have someone sign a FERPA waiver. In an appeal process, you can have an attorney represent you, and that is different from the initial hearing.

Q: Jim Collins: You explained the preponderance of evidence standard as “more likely than not”. If all you have is a professor's word against a student's word, whose testimony gets the greater weight?

A: Academic integrity cases are different. I have not been in an appeal meeting where the faculty member did not bring in the assignment in question.

Dr. Caseres thanked graduate students in general for offering feedback.

- b. **Melissa Vito, Vice President for Student Affairs:** Here to update GPSC about what's going on in Student Affairs. As the rest of the University, Student Affairs is going through significant examination and major organization. Duties include everything from outreach to dean of students, resident life, etc. Much of what the office is doing may seem undergraduate focused. Present to answer some questions, get some thoughts and ideas. Known issues in her eyes, particularly with transformation, are workload, class sizes, issues around how students connect, or the lack of social environment.

Q: Helena Morrison: Do you know what the graduate retention rate is? A lot of attention is given to dropout rates in undergrad education. Is dropout a problem for grad students? Is that data getting back to departments so they know how they compare to other departments?

A: I think it is an issue, but that depends on the program. Dean Comrie has the numbers broken down, by department, to look at MA and PhD programs. With graduate students it is hard to know what's behind retention issues. Comrie brought up the idea that the issues are similar to undergrad issues. For some, it doesn't feel like there is a good social environment, but again that varies widely from department to department.

Q: Stephen Bieda: We could try to increase social interaction. One thing we also do is student showcase, which requires a directory. How would you envision our role in facilitating social interaction. Should we hire a director?

A: I think it would be helpful. One issue we talked about last year, is that a pub on campus might help. Many schools have them. I don't know if that's something that could happen. We can work together to see what we can do. I would say, whatever fits with your structure is good. I am open to gathering information in whatever way is best to help.

Q: Erica Cirillo-McCarthy: Do you see any structure replacing the writing center to decrease the effects of the cut on student resources?

A: I think the Writing center is enormously important. I am committed to try to partner to keep it going. It is a critical service for all of our students. They are short about 20k to get through year. We are trying to keep it going and figure out what we can do.

Q: Bridget Barker: We are fairly understaffed. We have several people working pretty limited hours. We are limited in bringing in new people. We would like to increase our social activities. Is there any way to sit down and figure out how to fund more social events?

A: I contributed some money last year from student affairs. I wonder if there is a way to think through the student fee and see if support could come through that. I think another position is

valid, but I want to make sure, as the new review board is being set up, that we find ways to collect information from students about priorities so that the board always has something to work with. We could do this through directly supporting someone or through supporting something else through freeing up resources.

Q: Robert Jacobi: Is the new fee in effect before the board is formed? Will the board review whether the money will actually achieve the goals it was supposed to?

A: We had done a survey of all students, they used top priorities to determine how to allocate money for this year. for the future it will be the board's decision where to allocate. I think we should always keep survey in the mix to keep the board more accountable.

Q: Melissa Vito: I have one more idea to bounce off you. We have a contractor. we are looking at an area that could be student housing. That might be a place to add graduate housing with health sciences and the law school. do you think that idea has merit? My idea is student are here and don't want to live on the south side of campus, so I don't know demand. I was curious to see if it was rational to follow this lead.

A: Kunal Ramani: I think it would be beneficial,

A: David Lopez-Negrete: Is Aldea completely filled? How much demand is there? Is there a wait list?

Q: Jim Collins: How many housing units are you looking at? Costs? Are we talking graduate housing needs, like 100 rooms? Christopher city hasn't been replaced, has it?

A: This plan is too preliminary for those details. My thought is that the neighborhood would not want undergraduates, but upper division or graduate students. We are interested in doing other stuff, looking at childcare, maybe that would be a place to also do childcare. I am definitely thinking more than 100. In Christopher city, which was really cheap but with little quality, ironically, the family housing was small. We couldn't find anything to meet the needs of families. The family housing must be not expensive, and close to campus, so we now use proceeds from selling Christopher City to subsidize housing for students with families.

Q: Jed Laver: There is a proposal for housing south of kino for families.

A: I haven't heard much about it. I think it would be good for that area to develop as another research park area, with housing and research activities, it would improve the area, but i think that is further down the road, and as the economy has gotten worse, the plan doesn't seem as realistic for near term.

Q: My constituents don't have kids, and graduate housing is priced above what they can reasonably afford. Any idea what they could do?

A: What we're looking at we won't run, so overhead costs are not a part of it. The housing we have is at market or more because of staff and building. I don't know what rates would be, but i hope they would be market or below. Whatever happens, there will be opportunities for student input.

Q: Robert Jacobi: Partnership, what would it entail, does it bind us to any payments or anything?

A: No it does not bind us to anything we are not involved in a financial way at all. Their success is dependent upon the university being here, and property they are looking at is currently owned by us. We are giving them location, and population and we want to know what we get in return.

Q: David Talenfeld: do they get the space indefinitely or is it a long term lease?

A: Still too preliminary, I don't know.

Melissa Vito thanked the GPSC and exited the meeting.

III. Officer Reports:

President – *Stephen Bieda* – (1) Sent via e-mail. Questions after item 5.

Vice President – *Boris Glebov* – none

Assembly Chair - *Bridget Barker* - Blood Drive. We had a goal of 300 units, got 303. I will write a letter to the editor of the wildcat. We have our date March 10-11. It doesn't cost us, and it was very successful.

Treasurer - *Sanket Unhale* - (1) Rec center advisory council: The expansion is on schedule, expected completion Thanksgiving 2009. Grand opening January 2010. The Rec center had a 5% budget cut, so they cut some positions. Expecting 10% for next year. Not sure what to do about the cut. Might lead to new fee or increase in fee. We will keep an eye on that. The council has \$65,000 at disposal. If you have suggestions on what needs to improve forward them.

(2) Research Policy committee meeting: Main points: we don't expect savings from the white paper proposals. No proposals call for closures. Maximum we could save is about 5 million. There were no mergers, just talks about it with chemistry and biochemistry.

Secretary - *Emily Connally* - Election Night at the Shanty. Pass the emails around.

Interim Policy Chair - *Robert Jacobi* - defer.

IV. Representative and Director Reports –

Jessica Gerlach - Showcase. Friday 11am - 4pm, Saturday 11am-3pm. If you are able to stop by or help, we sent a sign up sheet. Our main times are from 11-12 and for cleanup in the evening, after 4. Spread the word. In front of UA main library.

Lauren Sekora: Commencement committee will be seeking requests about how to format graduate services for graduation.

V. Questions for officer and director reports -

Q: David Lopez-Negrete: Are these only in written format? It is personal view, I think oral reports are great. I didn't think your reports were running over that often.

A: Stephen Bieda: E-mail will be my primary vehicle from now on. I was trying to see if anyone had strong opinions about it

Q: Jed Laver: I like writing it down, and having a summary.

A: Stephen Bieda: this is now public record, so you can forward it, and use the report as a vehicle to inform constituents. If anyone wants to send a written instead of an oral, that will help.

Q: Robert Jacobi: Is ASA legislative lobbying still in discussion? Is there any state action beginning soon?

A: Stephen Bieda: Yes, we have no legislative action yet. I am talking to Regent's without ASA.

VI. Swearing in of New Representative:

- a. Sarah K. Smith College of Fine Arts

VII. Consent Agenda Item: reading and approval of minutes.

- a. **September 24, October 1, October 8**
- b. Bridget Barker moved to put the approval to vote. The minutes were approved with 5 abstentions.

VIII. Consent Agenda Item: Club and POD funding - One objection, moved to new Business.

IX. New Business

- a. **Club and POD funding-** Robert Jacobi: I have an objection to funding the IBWG: it does not seem open to all students and is thus not fundable. Do they advertise so that everyone has an opportunity to buy tickets?

Robert Jacobi made a motion to deny all funding. Stephen Bieda seconded the motion.

Point of information by Jill Burris: This is a working event, they have different events, all are open to everyone. I can forward the information along.

With clarifications, the motion and second were withdrawn.

Stephen Bieda moved to approve the decisions made by the appropriations committee. A Quadir Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with one abstention.

- b. **University Transformation Process - Robert Jacobi -**

- i. Memo: We basically incorporated points that Boris Glebov presented. We have added a few other things to the memo. Discussion of the memo and overview of main bullet points commenced.

Emily Connally made a motion to approve the content of the memo, with basic text revisions. Stephen Bieda included a friendly amendment of a time limit by Friday, 10/24, at 5pm. Helena Morrison seconded the motion and it carried with two abstentions.

- ii. Robert Jacobi: A recent sweep of funds occurred. The administration is looking at short-term ways to raise money more quickly. Vacant lines for faculty were taken by central administration. Differential tuition lines were there, they were swept as well.

Point of information: Jed Laver: Because we are faculty short, the sweep took 20% of our operating budget out on Friday.

A: Robert Jacobi: Technically 100% is back under college control, not department. Now each dean is to reallocate appropriately, but not all is under his jurisdiction. Hourly wages were not swept. GTA money is now at college control for the new year.

Q: Helena Morrison: What is differential tuition? Do we have a separate pot and it goes back to our college?

A: Robert Jacobi: The money should be at your college level already.

Q: Erica Cirillo-McCarthy: Questions about funding for TAs is the dean in charge of paycheck now?

A: Robert Jacobi: I don't know those details of the process now. Overall amount of sweep was over 40 million. but they also swept accounts that were not vacant. No one really knew how much was saved by a big sweep. they don't know how much had been allocated. New money will be coming into those lines at the departmental level.

c. **Room and Procedure for Dr. Shelton's visit** - Stephen Bieda - Next meeting, November 5, Law 164. I have requested that this is a formal meeting. Business Casual dress encouraged. Have received requests that people will be present. Do your best to arrive early. Probably pre-assigned seating. Robert's rules of order will be used to make sure we don't go over time. We have 30 minutes with him only. He must depart by 6:30pm. Time limit: 4 people, 2 minutes per person. We will start promptly at 6pm. Make Bridget Barker aware of anyone wanting to be an audience member.

d. **Student Showcase Update** - Bridget Barker - Will send memo with details about Student Showcase.

X. **Motion to Adjourn** – at 8:04 pm Emily Connally moved to adjourn; the motion was seconded by David-Lopez-Negrete and carried unanimously.