

**GRADUATE STUDIES POLICY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 7 NOVEMBER 2017**

Approved: 5 December 2017

CALL TO ORDER:

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00am.

ROLL CALL:

Roll was taken.

Voting Members: Barata, Data; Bogazianos, Dimitri; Bradley, Anne; Coleman-Salgado, Bryan; Hayes, Hogan; Lee, Jai (absent); Lindsay, Anne; Lozano, Albert; Topping, Troy (absent); Wassmer, Rob

Non-Voting/Ex-Officio Members: Heather, Julian (absent); Newsome, Chevelle (absent); Nguyen, Jackie; Gomez, Amelia

GUESTS: Migliaccio, Todd (Dir. Of Grad Studies)

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Approved

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF 17 OCTOBER 2017: Minutes not ready for approval.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

Time Certain 9am: Guest, David Earwicker: Bogazianos reported that Earwicker had communicated that he would not be able to attend.

Open Forum: Bogazianos reported that starting in Spring 2018, he would be requesting the GSPC Vice Chair to take the meeting minutes, noting that all other senate committees are run this way, and that taking both the minutes and running the agenda is too much.

Coleman-Salgado asked if there were any updates about the e-filing of theses, and Migliaccio reported he would be talking to grad coordinators about the fact that starting Spring 2018, hard binding of theses would not be required.

Information Items:

1. Report from Chair: Bogazianos reported that, during open forum at the last Executive Committee meeting, he asked about the status of the Grad Task Force report and was that the issue would be looked into.
2. Report from Graduate Dean: Nothing to report.
3. Report from Statewide Senate: Nothing to report.

Discussion Items:

1. Policy Updates:
 - a. *Graduation with Distinction Referral:* Discussion primarily revolved around the reporting timeframes that would give allow for the most accurate reporting about the percentages of



SACRAMENTO STATE

Faculty Senate

distinctions being given. Wassmer noted that the percentages had been agreed to, and that if depts. do not follow the requirements, then it hurts the meaningfulness of the distinction. Other members did note that the size of the dept matters, and that smaller depts. can be hurt when being held to the strict percentages in each year. Members also seemed to agree that the statistics do not suggest violations are in any way egregious. The committee agreed to recommend to support the Report as is, while also recommending that future reports, starting Fall 16, include 3 year reporting increments—3, 6, and 9 years—and that GSPC would review the Reports every 3 years and look for possible remedies for any problems that might arise at those later points.

- b.** *Co-authoring theses:* Lozano reported that around 3 in 10 programs in the College allow for co-authoring but that many have issues with the practice, mostly about the difficulty with assessing independent work, especially when students drop out of the project. Other members reported that their depts. were shocked to hear that the possibility exists. Bogazianos reported that he had been informally surveying all of the CSU campuses to determine what their practices were. He noted that, while a number of CSU's do not have their policies concerning the issue readily available, of those that do, co-authorship is rarely allowed, and if so, in highly strict ways. The large majority of campuses do not appear to allow it, with many expressly forbidding it. Members agreed that it is an important issue requiring further discussion, especially since it concerns the representation of grad rigor across whole campus.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:35am.