The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Shaun Schmidt.

I. **Minutes from February 18, 2013**
The minutes were sent to the committee prior to the meeting for review. The minutes were approved as written and will be forwarded to Faculty Senate.

II. **Discussion Items from the Graduate Committee:**
Shaun indicated the Academic Affairs committee was asked by the Faculty Senate President, Steve Angel to review the graduate proposal and Dr. Tim Peterson was here to provide information regarding that.

Dr. Pembrook explained Dr. Angel determined the faculty handbook afforded him the opportunity to send business that may not fit with the faculty affairs mission to academic affairs for review.

As a means of introduction, Dr. Pembrook explained the process the Graduate Committee went through to get to the point where a proposal was developed. He brought attention to the two points within the proposal: the makeup of the graduate counsel and then what the duties/responsibilities of the council would be.

The Academic Affairs committee members discussed at length who the membership of the Graduate Council should be. It was finally decided to ask language be changed to show the Grad Council membership would include a minimum of one (1) member per School/College with a maximum of one (1) member per degree. The members also should also teach in the graduate programs.

Academic Affairs committee members discussed whether the School of Law should or should not have a voting representative on the Graduate Council. After discussions, this issue remained unresolved. Shaun Schmidt had provided the academic affairs committee members a second
proposal for the graduate council which provided alternatives to the membership, recommendations for the quorum and for the selection of the chair in relation to faculty senate.

Some discussion ensued regarding Shaun’s recommendations and all agreed to the suggested quorum (2/3 vote). It was decided the Graduate Council should decide who the chair is and then that person should be on Faculty Senate. This would mean a change in the Faculty Senate bylaws.

The second part of the proposal involved the duties/responsibilities of the Graduate Council. All agree the graduate council would have the responsibility of the first (1st) readings of any graduate proposal with the Faculty Senate having the second (2nd) reading.

The meeting was adjourned.

**Meeting Schedule:**

Monday, April 1, 3-4:00 pm, Baker Room