

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Faculty Senate Monthly Packets

University Archives: Faculty Senate

1-1-1994

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet January 1994

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet January 1994" (1994). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 242.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/242>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Portland State University

P. O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751

TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate

FR: Alan Cabelly, Secretary to the Faculty *AMC*

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 3, 1994, at 3:00 p.m. in **room 53 Cramer Hall**.

Faculty are asked to bring the December 1993 Senate packet to facilitate the conclusion of unfinished business

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- B. Approval of the Minutes of the December 6, 1993, Meeting
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
 - 1. President's Report *\$5-8M reduction in 95/97*
 - 2. Provost's Report
 - 3. Project KPSU Radio—Nasca
- D. Question Period
 - 1. Questions for Administrators
 - 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
 - 1. Winter Term Registration Report—Tufts
 - 2. Library Committee—S. Taylor
 - 3. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate—Cooper
- F. Unfinished Business
 - 1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course Proposals—Levinson and Spolek
 - 2. Annual Report, Graduate Council—Spolek
 - 3. Graduate Council Policy Motions—Spolek
- G. New Business
- H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:

- B Minutes of the December 6, 1993, Senate Meeting
- Memo from Registrar re Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report
- C3. Project KPSU Radio
- E2. Annual Report, Library Committee
- F3. Graduate Council Policy Motions

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 6, 1993
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika
Secretary: Alan Cabelly

Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Barna, Bjork, Bowlden, Cooper, Crawshaw, DeCarrico, Etesami, Forbes, Fosque, Franks, Gray, Greco, Hales, A. Johnson, D. M. Johnson, D. Johnson, Jolin, Kenny, Kocaoglu, Krug, Lall, Limbaugh, Midson, Moor, Oshika, Parshall, Reece, Seltzer, Smith, Tama, Visse, Vistica, Watanabe, Watne, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Dusky for Abrams, Becker for Burke, Goslin for Gillpatrick, Kenreich for Kimball, West for Manning, Brodowicz for Svoboda.

Members Absent: Barton, Beeson, Brenner, Briggs, Falco, Farr, Jackson, Lansdowne, Liebman, McGuire, Miller, Schaumann, Talbott, Westover.

Ex-officio Members Present: Bowlden, Cabelly, Desrochers, Erzurumlu, Kaiser, Koch, Levinson, Mestas, Pfingsten, Ramaley, Reardon, Spolek, Toscan, Toulan, Vieira, Wamser, Ward, Weikel, Wineberg, Zareh, Zeiber.

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM and made the following announcements:

1. The order of the Senate meeting will be changed. E5 (Student retention report) will come first, then E4 (Scholastic Standards Committee), then E1, E2, E3. Additionally, the IFS report will be made as E6.
2. K-House prepares refreshments and sherry after every Senate meeting. Senators and *ex-officio* members are encouraged to attend.
3. Steering Committee members are requested to remain for five minutes after the Senate meeting for a brief informational meeting.
4. The Library Committee report will be made in January.
5. A letter regarding the Oregon Food bank will go out this week. It will endorse the collection of goods on campus. The letter of support is from various organizations, including the Faculty Senate.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

It was noted that Dean Toulan's name had been spelled incorrectly. With that correction, the minutes of the November 1 and 8 meetings were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. President's Report

RAMALEY noted that she had asked the Advisory Council what she should report to the Senate. They were emphatic in saying, "the budget." Currently we know little about the budget. The messages from the voters to public officials are to spend less and to do more with what you do spend. The Governor's response apparently is only to spend less, ignoring the other half. RAMALEY and REARDON have been trying to reinforce both, to say that PSU is doing this--spending less with minimum disruption for our students, but not faculty. Initial discussions with the Chancellor's office indicate that Higher Education will take a disproportionate share of the cuts. The Governor's budget targets a \$50 million reduction in the remainder of the biennium from the state general fund, and another \$150 million in other funds. Higher education is expected to absorb \$15-\$20 million of the cut, 30-40% of the total: Higher education's share of the state general fund has been 11%, so this is higher than a proportional cut. RAMALEY does not advocate an across-the-board cut; this would be difficult, because K-12 will take few cuts, and higher education seems to be the biggest target of opportunity. Within the state system, the Chancellor has cut across the board in the past. The PSU share is 17%, which means we would take a \$3 million cut over a two year period. Operationally, this becomes one and a half years. However, we did not receive budget guidelines in November, and cannot serve our students with the cuts coming this late. We are making this case. Our criteria for making cuts or increases to the budget continue to be:

1. Current/past performance.
2. Performance enhancements, to develop better curriculum.
3. Levels of access needs.

PSU does well under these criteria, so across-the-board cuts within higher education are not feasible. There is much to be done to meet these needs. We will be open, and meet with Senate, either between or during Senate meetings. DESROCHERS noted the debate on whether the Governor can make these cuts in mid-biennium. The legislature may disallow this. RAMALEY reinforced the PSU Currently hot line (5-6399), and also asked faculty to direct questions to Carl Wamser, the Faculty Advisor. In response to A. JOHNSON's question, RAMALEY noted that we would not necessarily cut by using the same criteria from last year. Circumstances have changed; we may not go to next dollar value from last year's list, but will continue to use consultation as part of the decision making process.

RAMALEY also noted her responses to the Brock Report in The New York Times. She was quoted the opposite of what she said. The Brock Report says that the business community is upset that the youth of America lacks values, and has various recommendations to respond to this. Reardon might also write an article on undergraduate education in Daedalus magazine. The report also deals with students

different from the PSU type; they are eighteen years old, have never worked, and live a cloistered life. RAMALEY should have been quoted as being in favor of community service.

A. JOHNSON also congratulated Ramaley on the birth of her grandson, Adam, who was born on December 2, and is the most beautiful baby since

2. Provost's Report

There is no Provost report.

QUESTIONS

BJORK asked about letters to the Editor (Oregonian) regarding praying at football games.

RAMALEY noted that this was in response to an Oregonian article titled "Praise the Lord and Pass the Football," which discussed several universities. There is a voluntary chapel, using no resources, no proselytism. The other issue is that after games the football team assembles on the center of the field, after the game, reciting the Lord's Prayer. This started about five years ago, strictly as a student led activity. There is a question of how "voluntary" that is, because this is a group bonding activity. Team, coaches, and Athletic Director have met, agree that they like the bonding activity, but will delete the prayer and simply have a moment of silence to continue bonding. Surprisingly, this has not been raised at UO or OSU. WAMSER stated that a letter to the Oregonian will have the University response.

DESROCHERS responded to prior questions regarding CH 53 and LH 175. Koch, Lorraine Duncan, and AV have plans for the introduction of faculty into these rooms. We are currently in the search process for a Director of Information Technologies, who will oversee the process upon arrival (hopefully by June), and probably streamline the processes. Duncan is now the prime individual to facilitate the training of faculty using these rooms, for trouble shooting, and to respond to individual members' software needs.

In response to A. JOHNSON's question regarding an advising question he brought to the Steering Committee, OSHIKA noted that this would come in January, after the Steering Committee meets in December.

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

5. Committee on Undergraduate Student Retention—KINNICK began by noting that all Senators, Deans, Directors should have received copies of the report. It also went out to various student groups; Pat Erdenberger helped with this process. The report is a distillation of eight to ten data sources that have been collected over the last few years. The committee developed a great deal of information, and organized it with various themes as noted in the report. Then a smaller group looked at some of the main issues,

again as noted. The next steps are to get feedback, including open forums during winter, and written comments given directly to KINNICK. She concluded by thanking all who served on and contributed to the committee, as well as the President and the Provost for their funding and endorsements.

In response to A. JOHNSON's question about the committee's specific recommendations, KINNICK noted the four main themes of the report: 1. The Provost should convene a group of faculty to examine the implications of the report in regards to teaching and learning; 2. The Dean of Students should convene faculty to study the NH experience; 3. Advising should be examined to ensure that students receive high quality advising; and 4. We should try to connect all students to someone who is here. This report has all the data and findings for implementation. KINNICK concluded by calling for all the appropriate people to review the findings and make their own assessments.

OSHIKA suggested that the Faculty Senate develop an ad hoc committee to review this report and be a contact point. It should determine how faculty can support the process. Those interested should come to OSHIKA before the January meeting. A. JOHNSON wanted to get this as an agenda item for February. OSHIKA thought that the committee would remain available as a resource. KINNICK concluded by stating that she used national information and statistics for the report. This issue has become fragmented elsewhere; we should try to deal with it in one body here. Without objection, OSHIKA formed the ad hoc committee.

4. Annual Report, Scholastic Standards Committee—ZAREH presented the report, noting that the biggest problem for the committee is still the issue of reading petitions in the summer. In response to A. JOHNSON's question about repeated petitions, ZAREH agreed that the committee should not get them unless there have been changes, but often does receive them without any real changes. A. JOHNSON then asked if there are administrative procedures to screen these, and ZAREH said that Penny Jester formerly did this. OSHIKA stated that Registrar Tufts sent a memo on these issues, and this will be included in the mailing for the January discussion. In response to A. JOHNSON's question about resolving the nine month problem, OSHIKA stated that many options are currently being explored. WINEBERG reminded the Senate that other committees have the same problem, and OSHIKA stated that a "super committee" is studying this for many committees. PARSHALL and OSHIKA then clarified the fact that suggested changes from the report will be studied later.
1. Quarterly Report, University Planning Council—WEIKEL stated that the UPC is one of the groups studying the utilization of committees across campus, as well as the utilization of the UPC. This may be impacted by educational reform. They have been asked to contribute to accreditation, along with the budget crisis. They have met with the Provost on this. The most exciting activity has been meeting with DESROCHERS on the draft of the University District report, with the final draft due in January.

2. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee—LEVINSON began by making one correction to the report, stating that the SBA option is now called "Information Systems," but still retains the designation "ISQA." Beyond this, he reviewed the policy issues that had been studied: first, a one-year curricular review process could work if the committee could meet over the summer.

The second issue deals with honesty in catalog advertising. Ricks told the committee that the average student graduates within six years. The committee would like to be able to drop courses after 6 years if they had not been offered; some had not been offered in 24 years. In responses to questions from MOOR, A. JOHNSON and BEESON, LEVINSON reminded all that human processes were available to respond to technology and service issues. OSHIKA thought that active review is the intent of the committee.

LEVINSON also wanted a ruling that 410s be taught no more than three times, as stated in university guidelines. Banner and administrative staff can review this. Department Curriculum Committees should also review these. Dual listing was also studied this year, with much ambiguity of result. The committee's conclusion is that clear policy statements are important for a historical record.

LEVINSON then moved acceptance of the report. A. JOHNSON asked what happens if the report is accepted? He thought that accepting the report only recommends that the recommendations be studied later. OSHIKA, noting that this issue has come up before in informal discussions, stated that a resolution is necessary. In a linguistic sense, the illocutionary force of a report must be decided. Do these recommendations have power, or are these simply assertions that the committee has made recommendations. What kind of force does it have? GOSLIN moved to table the motion. HALES thought we should simply accept the report, but make no decision to accept the recommendations. OSHIKA said that in the past, accepted reports have taken on the aspect of policy without that explicitly being stated. We can do this, and note that if any of these recommendations become policy, explicit motions be made in the future. A. JOHNSON and MOOR noted past practice of the Steering Committee and the Senate to ask for specific motions, and that we should continue this. OSHIKA also thought that we should thank the committee for its report and efforts. GOSLIN reminded the Senate that he had made a motion to table; there was no second to that motion. LEVINSON was asked by OSHIKA to withdraw his motion, with the Senate simply accepting the report without policy implications. He chose not to do so. MIDSON understood that we do not need a motion to accept a report, but would need a motion to agree to the policy implications. OSHIKA ruled the motion out of order, because it is not past practice. The Senate accepts the report as written, thanks the members of the committee for their efforts, and asks the Curriculum Committee to make motions regarding policy decisions in the future if it chooses to do so.

3. Annual Report, Graduate Council—SPOLEK indicated that the Graduate Council has accomplished much this year, with a great deal of deliberations as noted in the report.

The Council took two actions regarding joint Ph.D. dissertations and 700 courses. A. JOHNSON asked who will review theses in the future regarding style, and SPOLEK noted that OGS, through Koch, will give this information. In response to WINEBERG's question of consistency in reading petitions, SPOLEK noted that the Chair provides continuity. SPOLEK then noted the three policy decisions indicated on page 2 of the Committee report. SPOLEK/GOSLIN moved to accept the 3 policy decisions on page 2: Retroactive Credit Level of 400/500 Courses; Readmission of Disqualified Students; Conditionally Admitted Students. COOPER thought that the retroactive rule seemed sound, but that we might want exceptions. SPOLEK thought there was ample opportunity to do this during quarter. MOOR said that the process this way is cleaner, but still not satisfactory. Is the problem that there is no way of knowing what the student did? Faculty could see what the person did. KENNY said that students will come to the instructor a month after the course is over, and that this motion would take away the opportunity for the classroom teacher to help the student. FORBES thought that the question was one of what qualifies a course for graduate credit. Faculty specifically has the student do more. The student has ample opportunity to make these changes in registration, so he will support the motion. HALES, opposing the motion, reminded all that errors take place, and that by removing this, we eliminate the possibility of recognizing this. The requirement of documentation is upon the student. BRODOWICZ wanted to know how many students are affected by this; SPOLEK thought there were about five of these in the past year.

FOSQUE began discussion of the conditionally admitted students, asking if they are limited to nine hours. KOCH said that there had been no university rules, so this is a new principle/proposal. Nine is a specific PSU minimum, but the department can be more restrictive. LALL said that CE requires three specific courses. SPOLEK/GOSLIN then moved that the motion be partitioned into its three component parts.

FORBES moved back to the retroactive credit issue, suggesting that registration/mechanical problems should not be dumped into the hands of the Graduate Council. He therefore modified his support for this. DUSKY, Chair of the Deadline Appeals Board, stated that she always gets petitions of this nature. Many of the problems are the result of poor faculty review of petitions. If this were passed, the DAB would automatically reject these. She also noted that there is a question of differential tuition. TUFTS asked for the privilege of the floor, wondering if a specific time period would help. He thought that many students do not know until they receive their grade report, right after the term ends, that they had registered for the wrong level. WINEBERG wondered if a student could go from Committee to Committee, until the "right" answer was received. TUFTS thought that DAB responded during the current term, and that the SSC responded after the term ended.

SPOLEK stated that the Graduate Council desires to get out of the administrative action; SPOLEK/GOSLIN moved the following:

It will be the policy of the Graduate Council that petitions to retroactively change from 400-level undergraduate credit to 500-level graduate credit will no longer be accepted.

HALES thought it was inappropriate to give a student no means to appeal, but WINEBERG said that through a little known rule all students can always appeal to the Provost. GOSLIN/HALES moved to amend the motion by adding the term "one calendar year." SPOLEK thought that one year was too long, and that these actions should go to Graduate Studies, but not to the Council.

The amendment passed 15-8, placing the amended motion on the table.

A quorum call was then made. Twenty-four people are present; a quorum is not present.

OSHIKA noted that if those here desired, the Senate would move to CH 53. It was decided to do this, without taking any Senate action.

ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:40 PM, and moved all remaining action to the January meeting.

Portland State University

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 29, 1993

TO: Alan Cabelly, Secretary to the Faculty ✓
Juan Mestas, Vice Provost and Dean of Students
Rod Diman, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

FROM: Robert Tufts, Registrar *RT*

SUBJ: Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report

I am taking this opportunity to address the Scholastic Standards Committee's (SSC) recommendations. I share the concerns addressed, have discussed them on occasions, but was not present when they were formulated in this report.

First, on the Change of Grade subject, SSC has traditionally handled this subject. The six week deadline for grade option changes is a Faculty Senate policy, and after-the-fact changes are thus addressed by a Faculty committee in SSC. Grade option change requests that are current term (i.e., before a final grade) are, and have been handled by Deadline Appeals Board (DAB).

To let this matter simply be handled by all instructors or "academic units" would overturn the Faculty Senate's policy and make a shambles of finals grades. Without a deadline, every student would wait to see what grade he got and then choose his option. In essence there would be no Pass/NoPass system, but one system of A, B, C, D, F, P, NP; the student would let the instructor know which he wanted before grades are due - or after!

The withdrawal policy of 4 and 8 weeks is also a Faculty Senate policy. The recommendation would cede W's back to the individual instructor, which was removed over a decade ago.

Both PSU's grade option change and withdrawal periods are comparatively generous.

Second, the "request for refund" is technically a request for retroactive drop back into a certain refund period. The refund period and schedule are State System policy which has no provisions for petitioning. Again, DAB handles current term. SSC is handling request for which grades have been posted. Some matters could be transferred to DAB, but that committee is overloaded also.

Third, the issue of not taking responsibility for certain traditional petition subjects is now in place; SSC is refusing to address them. The petitions have languished and students were being greatly inconvenienced. An interim administrative review procedure has been instituted pending some resolution.

Lastly, the summer availability of committee members to address petitions is a long-standing structural deficiency. Ad hoc arrangements, usually of a few volunteers, squeaks us through the summer.

xc Hormoz Zareh, Chair, SSC
Fran Fahey, RO

Project KPSU Radio

Project KPSU is an IFC-funded Student Development organization working to start a campus public radio station. We would like to report on our progress and to stimulate faculty member support and involvement in the project.

The importance of establishing a radio station at Portland State cannot be overestimated. With the changes occurring at the University, in state government, and in the demographics of the Portland metropolitan area, it is vital to the interests of the University that the ties between the community and the University be strengthened. A University radio station will serve to strengthen these ties as well as to provide an opportunity to achieve many of the objectives of the University.

Over the past year, Project KPSU has been involved in promotion, research, and funding development. We have looked at different methods of radio broadcast, we have researched the Portland radio market and the other OSSHE school radio stations, and we have explored possible relationships with area radio stations. We are well on our way to starting the station. Most significantly, recent talks with Benson High School's KBPS have presented us with the opportunity to access the air waves over their underutilized AM station.

We will soon be putting together programming to be broadcast from KBPS. In addition, we are forming an advisory board consisting of students, faculty, staff, radio professionals, and community members. We need faculty members to participate in all phases of this exciting public service project.

Over the next year we will train students, faculty and community members in the use of broadcasting equipment and radio station operation procedure. Together, we will produce educational, news, talk, and music programming for broadcast at KBPS. Together, we will establish an advisory board, station management and a programming format which will truly represent the needs and interests of the entire University community. All funding for the station will be supported through grants, IFC funds, donations, business underwriting, and membership drives.

The student members of Project KPSU are reaching out for faculty support, ideas, and participation. Any faculty member interested in our radio station project is encouraged to attend our meetings which are held every Tuesday from 2:00 to 4:00 in SMC 333, or to contact Don Nasca, Project KPSU coordinator, at 725-5669.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE REPORT
DECEMBER, 1993

LIBRARY COMMITTEE MEMBERS FOR THE 1993 CALENDAR YEAR ARE:

Sully Taylor, SBA, Library Committee Chairperson

Lois Becker, HST

Faryar Etesami, EAS

Gina Greco, FLL

David Johnson, HST

Jane Kristof, ART

David Martinez, SPED

Joyce Petrie, ED

Gregory Payne, student representative

Tavish McNaughton, student representative

Tom Pfingsten, LIBW, consultant to the Committee

The committee met about once a month throughout the academic year and once during the summer. The committee's activities revolved around three main issues **during** the year: the reduction in the library budget, advocacy activities for the **library**, and improvement of access for library users. Each of these will be discussed in turn in this report.

1. Budget reduction.

The Library's budget reduction plan was a recurring item on the Committee's agenda over the past year. The Library's portion of the Measure 5 cut was 7% of its annual base budget, or \$403,047. However, there were also hidden cuts in the loss of access funds, elimination of roll-over money from the previous year, and the impact on the book budget from rising subscription costs which added \$200,000 to the cost of library materials. These hidden cuts were not reflected in the Library's base operating funds, but their loss added to the magnitude of the budget problem.

The Committee's role was to receive recommended budget reduction proposals from the Library, and provide the Library administration with the Committee's reaction to the proposals. The Committee also gathered information from users of the Library. For example, members of the Library Committee met with two student leadership seminars to discuss budget reductions in the Library.

In general, the Measure 5 impacts on the Library are (1) cancellation of approximately 1,300 serial subscriptions (a 10% reduction in total number of serials) and a \$100,000 reduction in funds for monograph purchases (because of a loss of funds and substantial cost increases), and (2) the elimination of the fourth floor reference service point and a reduction of service hours at the first floor Information Desk in Library West, and the consolidation of units in Library East (because of the loss of faculty and staff positions).

On a more positive note, Library hours are being maintained this year at 93 hours/week (the same as last year), funding for the University Press Approval Plan continues, money has been set aside to use commercial sources to obtain journal articles not available in the Library, and capital improvements have been made in the Library's computer system.

2. Advocacy activities

There were two main activities the committee undertook with regard to advocacy for the library: drafting of a letter of support for the Multnomah County Library bond issue, and help in developing the adopt-a-journal program.

During the spring term, the committee drafted a letter of support for the bond resolutions concerning renovation of the Multnomah County Library, both of which passed. The letter, drafted by Tom Pfingsten and amended by the committee, outlined the positive effects on the local economy and community of the two libraries, and detailed the differences between the two libraries (e.g. there is only an 8% overlap in the two holdings). The letter was intended for publication in The Oregonian. Unfortunately, the newspaper appeared to be uninterested in publishing the letter. However, this activity helped the committee to clarify the different roles of the two libraries for itself in order to better explain the impact of the budget cuts on the library to those outside PSU.

Also during the spring staff of the Library as well as members of the Library Committee developed the idea for Adopt-a-Journal. Essentially, this is a program in which PSU staff/faculty or those outside PSU agree to pay the subscription price for one or more of the journals the Library has had to cut in response to reduction in the budget. Ninety-nine (99) adoption pledges were received, and 85 have been paid, for a total amount of \$3,854.90.

3. The Library Committee also tackled the question of increased loan periods for certain types of users, thereby increasing access to critical information. The major decision that was made in this regard was to change the loan period for graduate students to one 3-week check-out, with two 3-week check-out renewal periods possible. A major reason for this change is the switch to the automated checkout system that makes 3 weeks the standard. In addition, it allows a longer overall check-out period for graduate students. In addition, the distinction between teaching graduate assistants and graduate students in general was removed for purposes of check-out periods from the library.

Finally, the Library Committee received reports on the work of the University's Technology Committee concerning Audio-Visual Services and Instructional Television. As a result of the Technology Plan, the large capital investment being made in technology, and the hiring of a Director for Academic and Information Technologies, it was decided to move media into a new administrative unit. The Library and the media units will continue to work closely in areas of mutual interest, such as the acquisition and processing of music recordings.

POLICY DECISIONS

Motions to the PSU Faculty Senate - Graig Spolek, Graduate Council Chair

The substitute motion is made that the following be adopted as part of the Graduate School Policy:

Retroactive Credit Level Change of 400/500 Courses

Since all 400/500 level courses are approved with a provision stating that the requirements for undergraduate and graduate students differ, and since it is assumed that the courses are taught as approved, the Graduate Council finds it inconsistent that undergraduate credit earned in a 400-level class can be retroactively changed to graduate credit in a 500-level class. As a result, it will be the policy of the Graduate Council that petitions to retroactively change from 400-level undergraduate credit to 500-level graduate credit, based on academic reasons, will no longer be accepted. Petitions based on administrative reasons will be handled by the Office of Graduate Studies.

Explanation: The Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) often administratively approves graduate petitions. During the 1992-93 academic year, 90 petitions went through the full Graduate Council process and an additional 22 petitions were approved administratively by OGS. These were petitions concerning clear administrative errors. The most frequent example is a request for extension of the one year deadline for an incomplete when the instructor forgot to turn in the SGR. In addition, the Office of Graduate Studies, in conjunction with the Registrar's Office, often deals with administrative problems before they even reach the petition stage. Although some petitions which could be categorized as "administrative" in nature do reach the Graduate Council, it is usually because OGS staff do not realize the true nature of the request. Occasionally, we are presented with an "administrative" request in which the issues are not clear-cut, and those are always forwarded for full petition processing. The Office of Graduate Studies would administratively handle the problem of a student who discovers that he or she had inadvertently enrolled at the undergraduate level if the instructor provides documentation that the student satisfied the graduate level requirements.

The motion is made that the following be adopted as part of the Graduate School Policy:

Conditionally Admitted Students

A student admitted to the University on a conditional basis due to low GPA will obtain regular status after completing 9 graded graduate hours with a 3.00 GPA. A student on conditional status due to low GPA who does not achieve a 3.00 GPA after completing 9 graded graduate hours will have his/her admission changed to "Deny, did not meet conditions" and will become a non-admitted student. This policy should be implemented by the end of fall term 1993.

Explanation: Currently, there is no minimum university criterion for satisfaction of low GPA conditions; this policy will establish that criterion. This policy will not supersede departmental GPA conditions that are more stringent.