

# THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA. GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL STUDENT COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday September 24, 2008

## I. Meeting called to order at 6:11 pm by Bridget Barker

**Present:** Stephen Bieda, Boris Glebov, Bridget Barker, Emily Connally, Alison Betts, Jed Laver, Jill Burris, Stephanie Levitt, Robert Jacobi, Sanket Unhale, Erica Cirillo-McCarthy, David Lopez-Negrete, David Talenfeld, Helena Morrison, James Johnson, Tim Chambers, Roeland Hancock, Jim Collins, Tiffany Goforth, Sandra Nameth, Mabel Crescioni, Lauren Sekora

**Proxies:** A. Quadir Khan, Tucker Peck, Chizanya Mpinja, Kunal Ramani, Brittany Perkins

## II. Call to Audience - none

## III. Officer Reports:

**President** – *Stephen Bieda* – (1) Our efforts are starting to have an effect on administration. Various graduate councils across campus are getting word to deans about transformation process. I am pleased everyone is trying to get constituents going on this. ASUA and GPSC are talking about drafting a white paper together. (2) ABOR President Boice will be meeting with executive board next week. This will be a good opportunity to talk to someone with more influence on ABOR. Tuition will be the main topic. We hope to convince him that graduate and professional tuition discussions are important (3) We will be working together with ASUA on a white paper because of quick timeline. The hope is by 10/3 to have specific points to take into discussion with members of the executive board. ASUA and GPSC will coauthor this paper. Tommy Bruce is assembling a white paper to represent all students. Starting the week of 10/6 we will have a co-committee sitting together to draft white paper. From 10/8 -10/10 we plan to send to bodies for reading and approval.

**Vice President** – *Boris Glebov* – We had a meeting of the President’s task force on tuition rates but nothing particularly interesting happened. The president wants to go forward with plan I mentioned last time, so tuition won’t go up at a higher rate. (2) I still have not seen guidelines for white papers. Current thinking is that they will have it out by 10/1.

**Assembly Chair** – *Bridget Barker* – defer until representative reports

**Appropriations Chair** – *Sanket Unhale* – defer until new business

**Secretary** – *Emily Connally* – none

## IV. Representative and Director Reports –

a. *Lauren Sekora* - We had our first commencement committee meeting today and discussed whether it was preferable to have graduate commencement on Friday evening or Saturday

afternoon. We are waiting for deans to write back with the final decision. Any feedback of preference should be directed toward me.

Q: Robert Jacobi: Undergraduate and graduate are now certainly different ceremonies?

A: Lauren Sekora: yes.

b. *Bridget Barker* - Reporting on a recent GIDP (graduate interdisciplinary degree program) meeting. The GIDP is preparing a white paper to introduce the idea that graduate education should be completely interdisciplinary. Currently departments are resistant to having faculty on committees in other colleges, but that could all change, we are thinking about asking Dean Comrie to speak with us next week about implications for changing structure of graduate education. Just wanted to introduce white paper plan to see if anyone has heard anything about going to interdisciplinary model, and if we would want to have Dean Comrie give an overview.

Q: Boris Glebov: What would be different from right now. Would the grad college now give you a degree?

A: Bridget Barker: Either the the graduate college or college under which the interdisciplinary program is listed will grant degree. Grad programs could be more flexible, individual tracks can develop in respond to a perceived need, and programs could go away if there weren't people interested in them. Currently some departments have full time coordinators serving the needs of 10 to 50 students, but collapsing across disciplines can adjust the ratio so a coordinator is responsible for an equal number of students, across colleges. This could be a substantial cost savings.

Point of information: Emily Connally: Talk is that some departments in Social and Behavioral Sciences are already taking this approach in forming schools such as the mind brain behavior institute to bring common interdisciplinary combinations together under the same school.

Q: Erica Cirillo-McCarthy: English is thinking the same way, as a way to repackage and work closely with people in social and behavioral sciences. English department had a town hall and has been given approval for a separate white paper. The English Graduate Union will have a meeting on September 29th to get feedback from other departments to develop grad student white papers. How can we make sure all these individual white papers work towards the same goals for graduate students.

A: Bridget Barker: I think Comrie could address this question. Independent white papers are being encouraged, several interdisciplinary programs are developing their own white papers, some are writing specifically to suggest the mergers.

Point of information: Boris Glebov: It will be inevitable that there will be multiple white papers because time is so limited, either we have one generic and not helpful white paper or many with different areas and specifics.

c. *Robert Jacobi* - Sanket Unhale and I met with the Academic Dean of Engineering, who wants to talk about what could be helpful with talking about transformation on college wide student lists, but is not aware of a system for it. We will meet with dean of college to get further information.

(2) Last Friday was the Shared Governance Review Committee meeting. The transformation plan was on the new agenda. The committee will try to make sure that shared governance is applied in all restructuring processes. All new units that arise out of this system are to be set up with shared governance in mind. The committee also moved to appoint someone to check that shared governance is being maintained in white papers in SPBAC. The committee asked the vice provost to give guidelines about judging degree of student input, whether input from students happened and if not, why not. Also want guidelines for how to determine what has passed in disagreeing white papers so that SPBAC has a way to judge, or some sort of guidelines for outlining input.

Point of Information: Boris Glebov: The subcommittee does a first pass to weed out completely unreasonable white papers, then all of SPBAC will make a bigger decision on which white papers go forward to the provost. The transformation subcommittee was made to balance representation because there was concern that SPBAC is unbalanced in membership, partially because president has assigned more people.

General speculation of possible directions and deadline extensions continued.

d. *Tim Chambers* - College of science had town hall meeting, one piece of new information was that the way Provost Hay may be thinking about allocation of funds after transformation, She has been envisioning buckets that units with different strengths and weaknesses.

e. *Alison Betts* - All the English department would need to reinstitute writing center services to grad students is about \$6,000. We have heard that some programs require or encourage students to use the writing center and would like a feedback about requirements of those programs. About one sixth of the writing center's users are graduate students, particularly international students.

f. *James Johnson* - Optical sciences had an all student meeting with the dean to go over how transformation would effect the college. Two main points: (1) discussion of whether optics should be staying on own or merging with college of engineering (2) the University noticed we were making almost nothing from our patents, so there is a push to increase licensing from these patents to help ease budget crunches. This could affect us because we either make or work with companies that license the patents.

g. *Jed Laver* - We also had our college meeting today with the deans and the plan seems to be in favor of going from two schools to one and incorporating other units with natural resources to be more technical driven school. Our college is small and has been offered to be acquired by both college of engineering and of art.

h. *Helena Morrison* - We had a meeting and town hall. Nobody returned with any real concerns Programs are mandated by the state to fulfill nursing and nationwide lines. We are supported independently and have no local graduate students, so we cannot lose GA positions we do not have.

i. Some students are having issues with trying to get \$3 lunch, we don't "look like" students and they cannot access our information to confirm student status. They don't have authorization to check, only to ask. Tim Chambers is on the Student Union committee, meeting next week, so write up complaints for him. \$280,000 of fee money went to provide better food with our fees, so we should complain.

**V. Swearing in of new representative – College of Public Health Representative Mabel Percioni**

**VI. Reading and approval of minutes –**

- a. Sept 10, 2008 - Boris Glebov moved to approve the minutes with typos corrected. Dave Talenfeld seconded the motion, which passed with two abstentions.
- b. Sept 17, 2008 - Robert Jacobi made a motion to approve the minutes. James Johnson seconded the motion, which passed with one abstention.

**VII. Bill of Rights - Boris Glebov -** To recap, a Bill of Rights and Responsibilities was approved last year, and we attempted to get some kind of approval from grad college for the document but ran into a problem because the University thought we were requesting it be made into law and policy. The solution that I proposed was that the graduate college approve the Bill of Rights in a generic way, like a mission statement. Of our proposed bills, 95% already exists on record. OF the portion that currently exists on book, we sill research specifically which policies numbers and appropriate exemptions apply, make a list and put it on our website, for people who encounter problems. The other 5% we can pursue the actual change and change policy on books as we see fit. We will also pursue endorsement of those principles from the graduate college. The graduate college is writing a mentoring handbook to give to faculty hires, the philosophy on how faculty should interact with students the authors suggested that the GPSC write a section for this document, like an essay, or position paper ton what we believe our rights and responsibilities are. I am presenting three things. One, we split the bill of rights into a section of reference on the website. Two, we pursue policy change for what is not on law. Three, we write a chapter for the mentoring handbook outlining the need for the bill of rights and responsibilities. I want approval of council on this plan or new ideas of how to handle this in a different way.

Comment: Jim Collins: Boris seems right on track. I guess we are in no rush to do something official with bill of rights, we could just take what we have or write into bill of rights, cite the policy. Maybe we should just take the other 5% and discuss it, as part of the process of getting the larger document approved.

Q: Mabel Crescioni: Can you go over that 5% of rights not addressed already in law?

A: Boris Glebov: One area was protection of free speech. current regulations are drifting toward privacy and security of people on campus, not free speech. Another area was something like paternal leave, but the committee on status of women has addressed. You should consult the documents for more information.

A: Jim Collins: one other issue was whistle blower protection for grad students who are not employees.

A: Alison Betts: There are antiretaliation policies in ABOR and UA guidelines. The law specifies members of the university community have rights to be free of retaliation for a variety of actions.

Tim Chambers moved to approve Boris Glebov's plan of action as outlined, the motion was seconded by Emily Connally and carried unanimously.

### VIII. New Business

- a. **Club and POD Funding** - Sanket Unhale - Appropriations Committee has decided to do all communications electronically, so all club funding will need to be submitted online now. Only electronic applications will be accepted.

Q: Robert Jacobi: can you send an email out when the website will be updated?

A: After next round of applications we can have the policy changed.

POD funding: Days Beyond Recall was rejected again. LOGOS fully funded, has done same event in the past.

Q: David Talenfeld, when is the next deadline?

A: October 15th, we will accept paper applications but will change as soon as possible.

Q: Boris Glebov: historically at this time of year are we ahead of budget?

A: Stephen Bieda: Yes the peak period is usually October.

Q: David Talenfeld: we were running a deficit, now we are spending ahead, do we know what the current deficit is?

A: Stephen Bieda: Deficit had already been accounted for, so it is not a factor, otherwise we are in green for rest of the year.

Stephen Bieda moved to approve the funding recommendations. James Johnson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

- b. **White Paper guidelines** - Boris Glebov - We have no guidelines. All we know is they are supposed to be 3 pages long, Merideth Hay stated there is no specified student participation in white papers, so it is up to us to get in to the papers.

Q: Jim Collins: Have we looked at what happens to GPSC's structure when we do not have the colleges anymore.

A: Stephen Bieda: not yet. We don't know what is going to happen, next semester may become more clear as to what kind of reorganization we might have and then we can talk about what to do. We have 400 students per rep on the council now.

Q: Robert Jacobi: In the GPSC/ASUA white paper, do we want to address points where we can save money, like we give 10% of travel grants money back?

A: Stephen Bieda: Travel grant money all comes from student affairs fee, as a student government, this money is all different from other money. The grad college sends 100k to deal with administrative office staff and travel grants. 50k comes from student affairs fee.

Q: James Johnson: One big concern with optical sciences is loss of the name. What is going to happen to the degree if it no longer says college of optical sciences? Wasn't sure what administration would be considering as far as the loss of status that this is going to inflict upon our degrees. Does the University have plans to get around this?

A: Tim Chambers: In higher level discussions have acknowledged the brand name recognition. This is an opportunity to join stronger programs, and get better brand names on degrees. The plan is to keep those that are good and change weaker to make them look better.

Point of Information: Boris Glebov: in conversation it has been suggested that optical sciences may be able to take on faculty, because of all dual appointments, if department is eliminated, person could be transferred full time to a static department.

A: Robert Jacobi: Even if a college became a department it would still keep ythedegree name, department has own degree names. Our academic dean said even if they rename or merge departments, they have no reason to rename departments or degrees, unless the whole program is eliminated.

Q: Jim Collins: what happens to weak programs, will they get to be something else?

A: Erica Cirillo McCarthy: One of demands made by students was to be able to graduate in program that a student started in, this is not an issue we should drop.

Q: Robert Jacobi: another thing GPSC may want to look at within our own proposal is that we have one of highest research overheads in country. This makes our grad students most expensive, though we get paid the least. Should we try to get the money back, but maybe we could address it and say in general it would be better to reduce overhead and make departments more competitive?

A: Boris Glebov: Overhead that is for graduate students pays for health insurance and tuition remission, the funds are, to a large extent, for supporting graduate student needs. Some money goes back to departments, in indirect cost returns and is frequently used to pay for TAs in those departments. I would like to see more transparency on how this money is spent. I will start a movement in committee of eleven for as much.

c. **GPSC letter with ASUA**

Q: Tim Chambers: I agree we should do one joined and one just from the GPSC, we have enough graduate student specific issues that writing our own paper is good.

A: Robert Jacobi: If we can get it into a few pages. I agree politically. The white paper is about bringing concerns.

A: Jed Laver: We are talking about doing one or both, but I think it should be more geared to find things within colleges that bridge or link to other departments, maybe several small courses could be combined into one. We should make specific suggestions about reorganization that could save money.

Q: Robert Jacobi: In terms of outreach, apparently ever subgroup gets a meeting with Shelton. Maybe we should do town hall meeting with GPSC or in each department, for us to even know what our students think. Point of information by Stephen Bieda: On October 17th I have agreed to give a forum at 5 o'clock in La Aldea to inform students.

Stephen Bieda made a motion to target our student issues with one only letter, joint ASUA and GPSC. Erica Cirillo-McCarthy made a friendly amendment to add a second letter, just from GPSC. David Talenfeld seconded the motion. The motion carried with one abstention.

Stephen Bieda made a motion to refer white paper proposal to the internal graduate student policy committee to have a position on what both white papers should say. Jed Laver seconded the motion, which carried with two abstentions.

Further discussion was deferred until 10/1, the emergency meeting called for transformation issues.

- d. **Treasurer position** - Stephen Bieda- Deadline for call for elections is this friday. If you would like to run, please give consideration and look online at what the treasurer does. After friday, Alison Betts will announce candidates and we will vote on it next wednesday to elect our new treasurer. Tonight we will also be sending out a proposed constitutional amendment for consideration regarding executive board structure.
- e. **Blood Drive** - Bridget Barker - Monday and tuesday next week, We have enough reps to cover, but could need more help 10-12 on both days. in the south ballroom of the SU>
- f. **Student showcase** - Bridget Barker - This is academic portion of homecoming. fairly successful in securing more money, some cash prizes. \$500 cash prize to best in show for both grad and undergrad. We will run ads in wildcat all week the deadline for applications is approaching. If you have not received a reminder from program coordinators let Carol know. If anyone has questions or concerns or for whom time commitment is an issue, have them contact Jessica Gerlach, the events director. We need people there when judging and awards are happening, but may be more flexible in addressing other concerns.

Q: Robert Jacobi: Two meetings ago we had a problem with how we can communicate with other students, and we tried to get an email listserv with all the students? Did we formally put that in play?

- g. Bridget: GPSC Announce fell away. We need to work with new webmaster to see how to put the link to automatically set this up. I am working on it. good suggestion.

**IX. Motion to Adjourn** – at 7:56 pm Stephen Bieda moved to adjourn; the motion was seconded by Alison Betts and carried unanimously.