

UCF Graduate Council

[Home](#) > [Policy](#) > [Minutes](#)

GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Minutes of October 12, 2006 meeting

Members Present Patricia Bishop, Max Poole, Paul Rompf

Recorder Rhonda Nelson

Guests Present Jeanne Leiby, Ivonne Lamazares, Dan Dill

Staff Members Debra Winter

The Policy Subcommittee met at 10:00 on October 12, in Room 243 MH. Members and guests were introduced. The minutes were approved from the September 14 meeting. Discussion began on the following items:

ETD Dissemination policy. Special guests from Creative Writing attended this discussion. The discussion centered on examining the 3 options that graduate students are provided to disseminate their thesis or dissertation. The issues are the balance between the universities desire for open access to information while simultaneously protecting the publishing rights of our graduate students. The committee suggested that the current ETD policy be changed so that one of the options would be to hold the ETD at UCF initially for 1 year but with exceptions for 3 years to allow for copyright and publishing to take place.

Professor Leiby indicated that the creative writers have special concerns because their work is copy written and may be published as a book, article, or short story in the future. She went on to indicate that creative writing students are required to publish their creative works. Professor Leiby pointed out that the university policy used to have a restriction of 10 years.

Dr. Bishop shared information that she had compiled from various websites of other universities regarding this policy. Penn State and U of Maryland were two that were favored. She indicated that Ohio State has a form that students are required to complete to delay their works being published. Penn State has three options. Leiby and Lamazares favored Penn State's policy. They liked the fact that it could be accessed by interlibrary loan and that it only be available to UCF. Dr. Bishop indicated T/Ds are not accepted without students clearing any published material that they use with publishers. Professors Leiby and Lamazares' concern was about students not being able to publish after the fact and indicated that the concern is that the publisher won't publish student's work if it's already been out on the web. Debra shared study from VA tech on T/Ds. It was pointed out that Amazon.com follows the wishes of the students. Professor Leiby indicated that she edits the *The Florida Review*. One of the questions that the publishers ask the author is if their paper has been published in part or in whole. If so, it is treated as a prior publication and the publisher is not interested in it.

Dr. Liberman indicated that if we change the policy, it needs to be accepted by all. There ought to be a timeline for disseminations for copyright or patents. Penn State extends their policy after 1 year to 5 years. The group then discussed the renewal process. We could have a form for restricting access. Dr. Bishop pointed out that UCF degree requirements are that a student needs to disseminate and publish their work as soon as practical. Professor Leiby also thought that Art, Music, Film and Digital Media would also be affected by this change. Dr. Liberman asked that a policy draft be prepared for the November 2 meeting. Dr. Bishop will prepare a draft and will create a sign off form to accompany this. Professor Leiby indicated that she planned to review additional websites. Dr. Liberman indicated that this will be the first item of our next meeting.

Policies at other universities:

1. Ohio State – one year at a time, with a policy of delay for that period.
2. Penn State – 3 options; open access, access to Penn State indefinitely, access only to the abstract for a period of one year to secure patents; will allow additional year only after approval, then author must choose open access or access to Penn State indefinitely.
3. West Virginia – 3 options; open access, WVU distribution only (sales), embargo.
4. UF – 3 options; open access, UF only for specified period, restrict access for 6 months for patent or copyright.
5. Virginia Tech – 4 options; open access, VT for 1-3 years, releasing portions of the work to others for 1-3 years, with open access beyond that time, secure for one year with extension for one year.
6. FSU – 3 options; open access, no release for 3 months (for patents), sequestering for no more than 2 months.
7. NJ Institute of Technology – 2 options; NJIT access only for one year (renewal for one additional year), restricted access for one year (renewal for one additional year).
8. UMaryland – 3 options; open access, restrict for 1 to 6 years; restrict indefinitely but require paper copy in the library with inter-library loan availability.

ETD use of Turn It In Software. Discussion occurred about the increasing misappropriation of information, particularly from websites, by inexperienced researchers and the need for faculty to work with them in identifying and ensuring that appropriation is accurate. The committee suggested that a

policy be drafted requiring that students submit their thesis/dissertation to Turn It In and share the results with their advisor and advisory committee during review of the thesis/dissertation.

Dr. Bishop shared that several instances of plagiarism have created problems with some universities. She indicated that if we adopt such a policy, it would be required that all T/Ds be checked by this software. She pointed out that the TII software can only check electronic works. The committee then discussed the possibilities of a policy and if we want to require all T/D to go through TIN software before submission is submitted. Dr. Liberman reported that their college, COHPA, uses this software now. Discussion followed on the control of the software and if this should be the responsibility of the faculty and the student's T/D Committee. The committee felt that this should be the responsibility of the student and his/her advisor to report that the T/D has been sent through TII. It was also indicated that this should be required at the time student submits paper to faculty member. A clarification form should be submitted that states that the T/D has gone through TII. Dr. Liberman asked that Dr. Bishop prepare a draft policy to be considered at the next meeting. Dr. Bishop agreed to draft the policy and send out to the committee electronically for their review prior to the next meeting.

Next meeting on November 2. Dr. Liberman reported that at the November 2 meeting, The GC Policy and Procedures Committee will begin discussions to develop a recommended statement about conflicts of interest that would apply to all faculty of the University. The input of faculty members regarding this most important subject will be most appreciated.

The agenda for the next meeting will be:

1. Review of draft proposals
2. Discussion of the desired role of the Graduate Council in doctoral program review
3. Beginning discussion of faculty-graduate student potential conflicts of interest

Adjournment and next meeting date. Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. Next meeting will be held on November 2, 10:00, 243 MH.